DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 071 627 HE 003 803

AUTHOR	Lopez, Ronald W.; Enos, Darryl D.
TITLE	Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California.
INSTITUTION	California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	211p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	*Ethnic Groups; *Higher Education; *Mexican Americans; *Minority Groups; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to provide an overview of Chicanos in public higher education in California. This overview describes both the major circumstances of higher education as they affect Chicanos and the characteristics of Chicanos in higher education. The analysis includes assessments and evaluations of the Chicano experience in higher education in both quantitative and qualitative terms. Recommendations include policy or policy alternatives that fall within the responsibility of the legislature and the various other institutions that direct the state's colleges and universities. (HS)

ED 071627

Chicanos and Public Higher Education in California

Ronald W. Lopez and Darryl D. Enos

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NOT FOR RELEASE UNTIL

FEB 4 1973

FOR INFORMATION CALL
DAN FRIEDLANDER AT (916) 445-4820

RIE 00 3803

PREPARED FOR

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

ED 071627

CHICANOS AND PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

Ronald W. Lopez
and
Darryl D. Enos

Prepared for

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

California Legislature
Assembly Post Office Box 83
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Assemblymen	Senators
John Vasconcellos (Chairman)	Howard Way (Vice Chairman)
Willie Brown	Alfred Alquist
Jerry Lewis	Dennis Carpenter
Ken Meade	Mervyn Dymally
John Stull	Albert Rodda

Patrick M. Callan, Consultant
Daniel Friedlander, Assistant Consultant
Sue Powell, Assistant Consultant
Elizabeth Richter, Secretary

December, 1972

This is one of three reports on minority participation - quantitative and qualitative - in California higher education. The papers were commissioned by the California Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

The primary purpose of these papers is to give legislators an overview of a given policy area. Most of the papers are directed toward synthesis and analysis of existing information and perspectives rather than the gathering of new data. The authors were asked to raise and explore prominent issues and to suggest policies available to the Legislature in dealing with those issues.

The Joint Committee has not restricted its consultants to discussions and recommendations in those areas which fall exclusively within the scope of legislative responsibility. The authors were encouraged to direct comments to individual institutions, segmental offices, state agencies -- or wherever seemed appropriate. It is hoped that these papers will stimulate public, segmental and institutional discussion of the critical issues in postsecondary education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART		Page
	MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE CHICANO STUDENT.	1
I:	THE PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY	5
	A. Introduction	5
	B. The Orientation of Our Report.	7
	C. Sources of Information.	12
II:	THE CHICANO IN HIGH SCHOOL: WHAT ABOUT COLLEGE?	14
	A. A Profile of Chicano Students in California's Public High Schools	16
	B. Where Do They Go?.	16
	C. Deciding Whether and Where to Go	18
	D. Counselors and Peer Influence.	23
	E. Policy Recommendations Regarding the Chicano and High Schools	28
III:	ADMISSIONS, FINANCIAL AID AND CHICANO STUDENTS	31
	A. The College Scene.	31
	B. Visitations to Campuses of Higher Education.	34
	C. Admissions and Financial Aid	43
	D. Recommendations Regarding Admissions and Financial Aid.	45
IV:	ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS.	47
	A. Conclusions.	58
	B. Recommendations.	60
V:	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION	62
	Recommendations.	69
VI:	CHICANOS AND GRADUATE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA: A SUMMARY OF ALL THE EFFORTS	70
VII:	CONCLUSIONS.	75
	BIBLIOGRAPHY AND RECOMMENDED REFERENCES.	81

APPENDICES

A:	Access to Higher Education: A Statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, Morgan Odell, May 3, 1972	A-1/A-4
B:	Sources of Primary Information for this Report	B-1/B-6
C:	Council Report 71-5, April 1971, Coordinating Council For Higher Education (Available at Source)	C-1/C-2
D:	Xavier Del Buono to Jim Nelson, August 30, 1972	D-1/D-7
E:	Joseph W. McGuire to President Hitch, et al., March 19, 1971	E-1/E-7
F:	Dr. Kenneth S. Washington, et al., Statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, May 3, 1972	F-1/F-8
G:	John M. Smart to Dr. Durward Long, December 16, 1971	G-1/G-13
H:	Resolutions Adopted February 20, 1969, Ethnic Programs, Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges	H-1/H-8
I:	Robert E. Kennedy to C. Mansel Keene, June 30, 1972, Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Policy and Program	1-1/I-11
J:	Questionnaire for High School Graduates, Spring 1972, Tabulation of Responses	J-1/J-4
K:	Questionnaire for College Freshmen, Academic Year 1972-73, Tabulation of Responses	K-1/K-8
L:	Questionnaire: Community Colleges	L-1/L-6
M:	Questionnaire: California State University and College System and the University of California System	M-1/M-13
N:	Some Comments from Students Answering the Questionnaire for High School Graduates	N-1/N-5
O:	Some Comments from Students Answering the Questionnaire for College Freshmen	O-1/O-3
P:	Spanish Surname Students as a Percentage of Total Student Bodies in the California Public Educational Systems, 1970; and Significant Data Regarding EOP and Chicanos in Higher Education in California	P-1/P-2

CHICANOS AND PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

IN CALIFORNIA

Major Recommendations for the Improvement of California Higher Education for the Chicano Student

California State Department of Education

1. We recommend that the State Department of Education be required to collect and maintain information on the numbers of Chicano students who graduate from high school, the numbers of high school counselors, staff and faculty who are Chicanos, and such other information that may be important in understanding and improving the education of Chicano students.

2. Propose and support legislation for the development of a program for training high school counselors in methods of recognizing educational potential in Chicano students, and in other Chicano cultural factors which affect educational potential.

3. Manage this counselor training program if it is established and funded by the California State Legislature.

4. Encourage, and if possible require, the cooperation of high school principals and school district superintendents with college and university efforts at recruiting Chicano students.

The California State Legislature

1. The Master Plan for Higher Education in California must be revised so that at least its sections on the numbers and quality of students, faculty demand and supply, and student financial aid, reflect the current numbers and importance of Chicanos on our college and university campuses. Their exclusion from the Master Plan makes their existence and that of programs that support them highly tentative.

2. The State Legislature should establish and fund a program for training high school counselors in methods of recognizing educational potential in

Chicano students, and in other Chicano cultural factors which affect educational potential.

3. Financial support of the Educational Opportunity Programs should be expanded to drastically increase the number of Chicano students attending institutions of public higher education.

4. Supportive services of Educational Opportunity Programs must be provided sufficient financial support to make the services available to all Chicano students on the campuses of the public colleges and universities.

5. The percentage of Chicanos receiving awards from the State Scholarship and Loan Commission must be expanded by providing larger appropriations, altering recruiting practices, or by establishing specialized programs that focus on the Chicanos as a reservoir of special talent.

6. A major expansion of the total funding of the College Opportunity Grant Program is critical since it has a high Chicano student application response.

7. Affirmative Action Programs should include a review process in hiring matters to ensure that minorities and women have been given the appropriate opportunity to apply for any open position before that position has been filled. This should be required by law.

The California Coordinating Council for Higher Education

1. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education should be made responsible for collecting and maintaining information on the enrollment, academic success, and transfer patterns of Chicano students; on the various programs affecting Chicano students, such as Educational Opportunity Programs, scholarship programs, and ethnic studies programs; and on affirmative action and recruitment efforts for each of the systems of public higher education in this State.

2. All information collected and maintained concerning Chicano students by the State Department of Education and the Coordinating Council and the systems of public higher education should be published in an annual public report, and should be presented in detail to the State Legislature. This should be the obligation of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

3. The Coordinating Council should be directed to divide the State into small geographical sections within which all high schools and colleges should be required to cooperate to maximize the collegiate potential and knowledge

of Chicano high school students. High schools should be required to annually present a list of their Chicano students to the colleges within their geographical area. Colleges should be required to send a recruitment representative to each high school. These areas should be so constructed that each has at least one college from the three systems of public higher education within its boundaries.

4. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education should conduct a reassessment of admissions criteria particularly in the instance of the UC system as a consequence of the remarkably successful academic performance of EOP students who are often in the category of not being admissible under "regular" processes.

5. The Coordinating Council should conduct an additional study of the Educational Opportunity Programs designed to isolate those positive components that have contributed to the success of EOP students so that the same processes can be used with all students. The procedure for this study are described more fully in the last chapter.

6. The Coordinating Council for Higher Education should conduct a thorough investigation of the Affirmative Action Programs in the State to assess their efficacy and define the problem areas.

7. The Coordinating Council should conduct a study of Chicano Studies courses at the campuses in all three of the systems of public higher education. This study should include a description of what courses are now provided, and some recommendations concerning standards that are useful in establishing priorities for Chicano courses. Chicano staff and consultants should conduct a major part of this research.

Public College and University Systems

1. The chief officials of the three systems of public higher education should encourage or require the use of Chicano students currently on college campuses for recruitment of other Chicanos into college. Credit should be made available for these efforts wherever and however appropriate.

2. Each of the three systems of California's public higher education should develop and establish a uniform policy of minimal curricular offerings in Chicano studies. Initiative for this action must be taken by the President of the University of California, the Chancellor of the Community Colleges

and the Chancellor of the California State University and Colleges.

3. The executive officers of each of the systems and of each institution must be encouraged to publicly state their support of Chicano studies.

4. Each of the State's systems of public higher education should establish a standing committee to review and assess the needs of Chicanos and Chicano programs. These committees should be created by and report to the chief administrator for the entire system.

5. The individual campuses must be encouraged and supported in the development and maintenance of Chicano faculty development programs. Support from the chief administrators of each of the three systems is important in achieving the needed action on the local campuses.

6. Executive officers of the individual institutions should be encouraged to publicly support Affirmative Action Programs while giving reassurance that the integrity of higher education is not being threatened. The chief administrator of each of the three systems must take the initiative in this regard.

7. The chief administrators of each of the three systems of public higher education should develop a hiring policy wherein hiring a Chicano, Black or American Indian to fill a new or vacant position may be done under normal hiring policies, but the hiring of someone other than a member of these three groups to fill such a position will be reviewed by the chief administrator on the campus.

8. The three systems (most specifically the two four-year systems) should completely eliminate traditional admissions criteria with reference to admitting Chicano students. New standards, which are to be developed by the Coordinating Council, should be applied in such a manner that any Chicano student, applying to any college or university of any public system who meets those standards, should be admitted to that campus. Further discussion of this recommendation is included in the last chapter.

PART I

THE PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY OF THIS STUDY

A. Introduction

This study was designed to provide an overview of Chicanos in public higher education in California. This overview will describe both the major circumstances of higher education as they affect Chicanos and the characteristics of Chicanos in higher education. Our analysis includes assessments and evaluations of the Chicano experience in higher education in both quantitative and qualitative terms. The quantitative data on Chicanos will be presented in both straight quantification (e.g., tables) and in reference to other studies that are useful for improved understanding (e.g., bibliographic information). In addition, the information which we have acquired from our own questionnaires and interviews will form part of the quantifiable base for the recommendations that are made.

Our recommendations include policy or policy alternatives that fall within the responsibility of the Legislature and the various other institutions that direct the State's colleges and universities. Policy prerogatives and responsibility in higher education are not always clearly defined; but since all aspects of the functioning of our public institutions of higher education are so closely related to the Legislature's actions and authority (e.g., in the all-important matters of finance), the recommendations presented in the report are in broad pragmatic terms which we believe to be most compatible with the legislative function.

In general it is essential to constantly remind oneself that the Master Plan was published in 1960; that many of the worthy ideals, guidelines

and recommendations were consistent with that era; but that today the realities of higher education and our society often demand approaches not included in that original document. In the Master Plan there are strong biases toward the status quo in many areas; growth projections for student enrollment appear today to have been extrapolations with a linear dependency; the character of students assumed by the plan is traditional and there is no recognition of possible changes in the types of people seeking higher education; the definition of a qualified student is a rather simplistic one; and the relatively new idea of an "extended university" is almost totally absent.

A point to be remembered in evaluating the Master Plan is that it was written before a significant number of Chicanos were enrolled in public higher education in California. There is, in fact, no mention of minority students and only a passing allusion to the economically disadvantaged. The omission of this factor (the economically disadvantaged student) is an important element in that the dramatic increase in enrollment of Chicanos and other minorities (most of whom are economically disadvantaged) has created difficulties and misunderstandings since the Master Plan provides no policy direction for their accommodation by higher education. Many of the recent campus problems have their roots in inadequate communications between the minority groups and the institutions and in a pervasive ignorance on the part of many faculty members and administrators of what Chicanos or other minorities might be all about. If our campus visitations did nothing else, they clearly demonstrated that many campus officials and leaders are confused about the educational future and needs of minorities. The Master Plan must be updated so as to clarify these issues and establish statewide policy regarding the education of Chicanos and the economically disadvantaged generally.

As we compared the content of the Master Plan against the current status and educational needs of Chicanos, we found errors of commission and omission. Specific recommendations for correcting these errors are made throughout this report, but the importance of that document's silence regarding such matters as ethnic studies and aid to disadvantaged students will be clarified now. The advances made by Chicanos in our State's higher education systems have occurred despite the Master Plan, not because of any support or guidance from it. These advances and those which are still needed must now be secured through their institutionalization in the Bible of California's Higher Education. When the pressures of recent student and minority movements fade further into the past, the changes that these movements produced which are incorporated into the Master Plan will be difficult to forget, but those not so incorporated will be easier to ignore.

B. The Orientation of Our Report

We believe that it is very important for us to be candid in recognizing the characteristics of this report that affect the accomplishment of its objectives. Our efforts at understanding the current situation of Chicanos in the State's colleges and university systems were affected by both the time limitations on the study and the complexity of the subject. Our attempt to bring together in this publication a collection of significant data and statistical information regarding the education of our Chicano population was constrained by our judgments as to which information is in fact "significant." These limitations do not adversely affect the validity or utility of this study, but it is important that readers recognize that this is not intended to be a totally exhaustive treatment of the subject. It stresses what we believe is important.

The most important characteristic of this report, as with any other report concerned with areas of social policy, is that it is based on certain beliefs and assumptions. We held some of these beliefs and assumptions (our critics will call them biases) before the study began, as a result of our own past experiences in California higher education.[1] Some of these beliefs were developed during the study. Essentially, this report is a position paper which seeks to describe and interpret, and in some cases, change basic conditions affecting Chicanos and California's systems of higher education.[2] Since we have been asked by the Joint Committee to recommend policy, we intend to briefly outline some of the most important beliefs and assumptions which underly this report and which influenced our policy recommendations.

Our most basic belief is that higher education taken as a whole in the State should serve the entire community, or perhaps more precisely, all of the communities of this State. Unlike the past, it should make its benefits available in more or less equal proportion to all interests and population groups. Thus, we find ourselves supporting a policy of "reversing discrimination" under the section on Affirmative Action Programs, with the objective being to drastically increase the number of Chicano faculty and staff at the campuses.

This belief does place us in direct conflict with the spirit and the letter of the 1960 Master Plan. There is a complete absence of policy

---

[1]The two authors combine twenty-nine years in positions as students, counselors, administrators and faculty, spread through all four systems of California's higher education.

[2]The body of the report is interlaced with statistics and data where these are useful for illustration of the narrative. The appendix contains additional information which may be of use to the readers.

recommendations or objectives regarding the recruitment and needs of minority students and faculty in the three chapters concerned with these matters in that document.[1] In addition, the University system is made the elite of the three systems of public higher education because it is restricted to the very "highest" percentage of high school graduates. But the nature of the credentials required for entrance to the University system are discriminatory against Chicanos. Despite disagreement between members of various committees authoring the Master Plan, high school success and standardized tests (e.g., aptitude tests) remain among its significant criteria for entrance into the University and CSUC systems.[2] Parts II and III of this report demonstrate that these criteria are useless in judging the academic potential of Chicano students.

Our second basic belief was succinctly stated by Morgan Odell of the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities in his statement on May 3, 1972 to the Joint Committee, when he said, "lack of financial resources should not be a determining factor in deciding access."[3] Unfortunately, finances are a determining factor in access, and a devastating factor among the State's Mexican-Americans who have a substantially lower per-capita income than the majority community.[4] Again we stand in conflict

---

[1] "Students: The Problem of Numbers," Ch. IV; "Students: The Problem of Quality," Ch. V; "Faculty Demand and Supply," Ch. VII in A Master Plan for Higher Education in California: 1960-1975 (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960), pp. 45-65, 66-81, 115-136.

[2] Ibid., pp. 4 and 69.

[3] Morgan Odell, "Access to Higher Education," a statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education for the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities (mimeographed), May 3, 1972; included as Appendix A.

[4] Frank G. Mittlebach and Grace Marshall, "The Burden of Poverty," Advance Report 5 of the Mexican-American Study Project, Division of Research,

with the Master Plan, though this time we believe that document's error to be one of omission rather than commission. In fact, the Master Plan has very few pages which discuss financial aid to any type of student. Where student financial support is mentioned,[1] there is no recognition of the special financial needs of Chicano students. The relative absence of any discussion of the all-important matter of financial aid for students seems to be based on a perception of the student bodies of the State's public higher education institutions as moderately affluent and able to support themselves. The complete absence of any policy recommendations with reference to financial aid programs for minority students is based on a lack of comprehension of the numbers of Black and Brown students who began to enter these institutions within five years after the Master Plan took effect.

Our third basic belief is that the cultural-ethnic differences of Chicanos should be recognized and accommodated by educational institutions. Thus, as an example, we strongly support requiring ethnic studies courses for all institutions of higher education in the State. There is almost no mention of curriculum in the Master Plan except with reference to the division of functions for each of the three systems. We believe that curriculum content should be determined at the local campus. Inclusion of at least introductory courses in Chicano Studies at each institution, however, does appear needed and reasonable.

Our fourth basic belief is that students, but for the purposes of this report, particularly Chicano students, need and should receive

---

Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles, California, July 1966, pp. 21 ff.

[1] Master Plan, pp. 6, 11, and 172 ff.

supporting services such as counseling and orientation programs. The personal importance of these expressions of institutional support were constantly demonstrated to be of great significance to the students we interviewed.

This is a critical point at which to restate our basic understanding of the importance and function of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. Like the Constitution of the State or the Nation, the Master Plan functions to legitimate and describe certain practices and prohibit others. Of necessity it must remain largely general and flexible, and therefore omit much of importance. It would be ridiculous to request that this document describe the specific details of student support activities, or those of many other recommendations we will include in this report. It would be both simple and appropriate, however, for the Master Plan to establish the requirement that counseling and tutoring be made available for the student needing them. Instead, the document requires that special programs for admission of students not meeting "normal" entrance requirements be kept to a minimum, and therefore articulates no policy for the needs of those students who frequently enter under these special programs.

Our fifth basic belief, unlike the other four, is a perception of a developing socio-political condition, rather than a value statement. We find that there is occurring in the State a growth in the wave of opposition to ethnic studies, Affirmative Action Programs, minority student admission programs, and many related efforts. This growing "backlash" is a result of many factors, including our society's institutional racism, financial pressures on colleges and universities, and reaction to the extreme measures of some segments of the student movements. These attitudes increase the difficulty in getting public higher education to meet its obligations to

Chicanos, and reinforce the alienation between the various populations on college campuses.

C. Sources of Information

We have relied on a long list of sources for information in the preparation of this report. These include the following:[1]

1. Written questionnaires which were mailed to more than 1,000 high school seniors and 1,000 college students with Spanish surnames who had concluded approximately one year on a campus. The names for this mailer were compiled from the student lists of six high schools and seven public colleges and universities located throughout the State in its major geographic regions. In most cases the questionnaires were given to the educational institution and they selected students with Spanish surnames. In many cases these institutions used their entire list of Spanish surnamed students. When the institution had more than 200 such students, they arbitrarily selected a point in their lists and sent the mailer to the following 200 names.

2. Site visitations, correspondence and interviews with students, faculty, counselors and administrators at selected high schools, public colleges and universities. Our original intention was to visit more high schools, but the absence of students from campus during the summer made this pointless.

3. Interviews with relevant staff at the State Department of Education. We also obtained written reports and statistical information from this Department.

---

[1]See Appendix B for additional details on these sources of information.

4. Interviews with a minimum of five top administrators in each of the three systems of public higher education in the State. We also obtained written reports and additional statistical information from these staffs.

5. A written questionnaire mailed to the chief administrators of all of the public colleges and universities in the State. These presidents, chancellors, and other chief administrators were under no formal obligation to reply. The response rate was quite good, however, particularly from the Community Colleges. Seventeen of the campuses from the State University and Colleges system and the University of California system responded. Seventy-four of the Community Colleges responded.

6. Interviews with staff from the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, which included staff in charge of community service projects, and a special research consultant. The Council was also helpful in providing us with valuable reports such as their report on Educational Opportunity Programs which is referred to as Council Report 71-5 and is available through the Coordinating Council at its source.

PART II

THE CHICANO IN HIGH SCHOOL: WHAT ABOUT COLLEGE?

The importance of the high school experience on the Chicano student's opportunity to attend college cannot be too heavily emphasized. Besides the obvious fact that high school is a necessary academic stage before college becomes possible, several other cultural factors make this a critical period in the education of these students. First, many Mexican-American students have grown up without the expectation of attending college. Thus, the transition from high school senior to college freshman is neither frequent nor smooth. As a result, these students must be educated and informed about college as an alternative very early in their educational careers, at least in the early years of high school if not much before that. High school is also the period of maximum peer influence for many of these students, and that influence often works against going on to college.

The obvious importance of the high school experience in determining the educational future of the Chicano student led us to assume that ample information on that experience would be available. We were disappointed. The State Department of Education does not know how many credentialed counselors are employed in the State's public high schools, nor how many Chicanos are so employed, nor even how many Chicano students graduate from high school annually.[1] The Community Colleges are not entirely sure what

---

[1]Memorandum to Jim Nelson, Compensatory Education, from Xavier Del Buono, Associate Superintendent and Director of Compensatory Education, August 30, 1972, "Questionnaire Sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education," included as Appendix D.

happens to their Chicano students who leave that system. The information at the presidential offices of the University of California system on the nature of the Chicano studies courses or programs at the campuses is extremely sketchy. In general, information on the education of Chicanos in this State is spotty, ad hoc, and usually the by-product of a more general study.

We do not wish to minimize the problems educational officials must face in attempting to collect information on how many students graduated from the public high schools in any given year, or how many students receiving EOP support in Community Colleges also receive similar support in the four-year institutions. What we wonder is how educational policy affecting Chicanos can be reasonably developed without such information. Again, we believe the culprit to be the spirit and letter of the Master Plan. The Master Plan, after identifying the Coordinating Council for Higher Education as an "advisory body" has this to say about its powers and functions:

> The Council shall have power to require the public institutions of higher education to submit data on costs, selection and retention of students, enrollments, capacities, and other matters pertinent to effective planning and coordination.[1]

There is, of course, no mention in the Master Plan of the need to obtain information on the special problems of minority or disadvantaged students. In addition, this data collection function of the Council is presented in a document whose only emphasis is on a traditional education and traditional students. Despite this absence of emphasis on information about minority students and special programs, the Council's report on Education Opportunity Programs is the best available. Personnel with the

---

[1] Master Plan, p. 3.

ability to collect and analyze information on the education of Chicanos exist in both the Coordinating Council and the State Department of Education. But neither agency is under any formal obligation to do so. Thus, we get a situation in which we have available a good report on Educational Opportunity Programs, but no information on how many Chicano students obtained high school degrees last year.

A. A Profile of Chicano Students in California's Public High Schools

In 1970, 16% of all students in the State's K-12 system were Spanish surnamed.[1] In the fall of 1971, Chicanos comprised 12.1% of the total number of seniors in California's high schools.[2] While there are no statistics available on the number of Chicano students graduating from our public high schools who go on to college, the State Department of Education has presented us with a "rough measure" that demonstrates that Chicanos enroll in Community Colleges at a percentage rate substantially below that of any other ethnic group, including American Indians.[3]

B. Where Do They Go?

Like any other potential college student in the State, a Chicano is most likely to attend a Community College. In fact, a Chicano student is even more apt to go to a Community College than the average California

---

[1]Joseph W. McGuire, Vice President of Planning, University of California, memorandum of March 19, 1971 to President Hitch, Vice Presidents and Chancellors, obtained from Chancellor's office, the last page of which presents in tabular form a "Summary of Fall 1968 - Fall 1970 Ethnic Surveys" pertaining to Community Colleges (see Appendix E).

[2]Dr. Kenneth S. Washington, Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction, et al., "Statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education," May 3, 1972 (see Appendix F).

[3]Del Buono Memorandum, Appendix D.

student. Among all students in public higher education approximately 55% attend Community Colleges.[1] Chicanos who enter public higher education can expect by present enrollment figures to have a 70% chance of attending a Community College.[2] Our own survey of recent high school graduates supports this since 65% of that population who are going on to college are planning to attend Community Colleges. The percentage of Chicanos attending one of the California State University and Colleges system campuses among all Chicanos in public higher education is 21%,[3] which can be compared with the overall student distribution of 28%.[4] The major difference in terms of what a Chicano can expect is the accessibility of the University of California system. Among Chicanos in public higher education only about 9% are in the University of California system. This compares with a figure of about 17% among all students.[5]

Thus, a realistic assessment of where a Chicano student who plans to go on to public higher education in the State of California can expect to go will lead us to the following conclusions. Among the Chicano students who go into public higher education there is only about half as much potential (as compared with all students) to attend a UC campus. There is about 7% less of a chance that they will go to a campus of the State University and Colleges system, but Chicanos have a 15% greater possibility of attending a

---

[1]Calculations based on Dr. Kenneth S. Washington's report (Appendix F) and the use in his "Statement to the Joint Committee" of statistics obtained from the Office of the President, University of California, 1/12/72, HEW Compliance Report, California State University & Colleges, 1971, and Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, May 1, 1972.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid. [4]Ibid.

[5]Calculations based on Joseph McGuire's memorandum, March 19, 1971, Appendix E.

Community College. At present Chicanos constitute barely over 3% of the total student population in the UC system, about 5% in the State University and Colleges system, and only 7.9% in the Community Colleges' population.[1] This is a dramatic under-representation when one perceives it in the light of the fact that Chicanos constitute at least 16% of the student population in grades K-12. Figure 1 (page 19) presents statistics relative to minorities in higher education in the State of California, 1970-71, as reported by Dr. Washington in his report of May 3, 1972 (the complete report is submitted as Appendix F).

Some observers might take solace from the fact that the relatively few Chicano students on campus today do represent an increase from the number who were attending college some seven years ago. This is dangerous for at least two reasons. Saying that things have improved in this regard often forms a beginning defense of the status quo. Secondly, the increasing financial pressures on educational institutions and the restrictions on student financial aid programs at all levels implies that the growth in the percentage of Chicanos on these campuses will decline. Our analysis in the last part of this report supports that contention.

C. Deciding Whether and Where to Go

There are many reasons for the type of distribution among Chicano students described in the preceding paragraphs. The questionnaire that was sent to Chicano students as part of this study sought to obtain some student

---

[1] McGuire memorandum of March 19, 1971 (Appendix E); Dr. Kenneth S. Washington's statement of May 3, 1972 (Appendix F), Community College table therein; and John M. Smart, Associate Dean of Academic Planning, The California State Colleges, letter of December 16, 1971 to Dr. Durward Long, Associate Director, Coordinating Council for Higher Education (Appendix G).

MINORITY POPULATION REPRESENTATION IN CALIFORNIA

Chicano	16.0%
Black	12.5%
Asian	2.5%
Indian	1.3%

SENIOR CLASS STATISTICS

	Fall 1971 - Grade 12		Fall 1970 - Grade 12	
Indians	1,120	.4%	914	.3%
Black	21,481	7.3%	19,802	7.0%
Oriental	7,236	2.5%	6,750	2.4%
Chicano	35,766	12.1%	32,186	11.4%
Other non-white	2,518	.9%	1,752	1.6%
Other white	226,697	76.9%	220,853	78.2%
Total	294,818		282,259	

(Spring 1971 total: 247,999)

MINORITY POPULATION IN COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA

	EOP	MINORITY	TOTAL
1970-71 U.C.	5,221	11,266	76,133
1970-71 State	8,428	24,589	152,777
1970-71 Private (AICCU)			117,400
1970-71 J.C.		75,287	339,991

ETHNIC BREAKDOWN OF MINORITIES IN COLLEGE IN CALIFORNIA

	1970-71			1969		
	University*	State Colleges**		Private	(Day Students) Community Colleges+	
Black	3.6%	7,317	4.8%	5%	28,599	8.4%
Chicano	3.2%	8,248	5.4%	3%	26,817	7.9%
Asian	7.3%	7,562	5.0%	3%	11,474	3.4%
Indian	0.6%	1,462	1.0%	0.2%	4,115	1.2%
Caucasian	85.2%	128,188	83.9%	88%	264,704	77.9%
Other non-white					4,282	1.3%
Total Minority					75,287	22.1%

* - Office of the President, University of California, 1-12-72.

** - HEW Compliance Report, California State University and Colleges, 1971.

\+ - Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, 5-1-72.

Figure 1

STATISTICS RE: MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, 1970-71

Source: Dr. Kenneth S. Washington's "Statement to the Joint Committee," May 3, 1972.

perspective on the factors that influence where a student finally does attend college. Money (50.3%) and distance from home (53.1%) were the most common reasons given for selecting a college.[1] In our sample population of students presently enrolled in an institution of higher education there was an extraordinary agreement with the high school graduates on these two factors (money, 49.2%; distance from home, 53.7%). Among the college sophomores there was only one other heavy influence involved in the choice of a college. That was peer influence. Nearly half (47%) indicated that their choice was influenced either on the advice of a friend or because of a friend going to the same college. The peer influence was also very strong (40.7%) among the recent high school graduates but they also indicated that their parents (42.8%) and counselors (40%) played a significant role in their decision. The latter two figures seem in sharp contrast with the college sophomores (22.4% and 23.9% respectively) but that may be a consequence of their being a year separated from the high school experience. This discrepancy also might be an indication of a growing sophistication and involvement of parents and counselors in their decisions. Counselors were identified by the respondents as an important potential source for improving the amount and quality of information about colleges.

Almost three-fourths (73.1%) of all of our respondents had spoken to a counselor about going to college and nearly two-thirds (65.9%) had spoken to a teacher about it. The recent high school graduates indicated that Community Colleges were the most frequently mentioned colleges (74.1%), closely followed by the State University and Colleges (63.5%). There were

---

[1] As we have noted in the appending item on primary sources of information (Appendix B), the data from our questionnaires is suggestive, but provides no statistical validity for generalization.

more instances of private institutions being mentioned (30.8%) than UC campuses (24.1%). The incidence of mention for these various colleges and universities is almost certainly tied to the student's academic performance. It might be interesting to note here that only a small percentage of students admitted that their choice was influenced by the fact that it was the only place they were accepted (recent high school graduates 13.8%, and college freshmen 18.7%). It is also possible, of course, that students were directed towards Community Colleges or away from the universities by their counselors for other than objective reasons. It is still a commonplace occurrence to talk to a Chicano professional person who went into higher education in spite of his or her counselor.

The respondents to the questionnaires made recommendations about how they felt Chicano high school students could best be informed concerning college opportunities. Their ideas in this area indicate indirectly how they might have been influenced or how they feel they should have been. Both the recent high school graduates and the college sophomores felt that the counselors had a primary responsibility. They felt that the counselor should better acquaint him- or herself with the student's individual needs; that the counselor should address part of his attention to informing the parents; and that most certainly there should be more advance notice of college opportunity than they believe presently exists. The respondents felt that bulletins were extremely important and that there should be enough of them in plain sight (not on some corner bulletin board) for the students to see. Ads should be run in the school paper when a recruiter is coming to the school as well as in community papers, and pamphlets and other literature should be available. Some suggested using films to inform students

about opportunities in higher education and to show some aspects of the college experience.

College recruiters were also perceived as being very influential. The students felt, however, that an insufficient number of individual interviews were being held and consequently not enough of the students' questions were being answered. The teachers should also play a role, particularly those in home rooms and government classes. The high schools and the colleges should organize discussions on what higher education is all about and more colleges should use recent Chicano high school graduates in their recruiting efforts.

One recommendation frequently made was the need to get the information about college opportunities to the students prior to the senior year. Many students felt they would have been better prepared or might even have chosen what they perceived to be a better alternative if they had had a realistic feeling at an earlier time that they might be going on into higher education. In short, Chicano students decide very late to go on to college, and therefore often do not make the best decisions.

While all of the above mentioned factors are important and significant, the most significant in the eyes of the students was clearly finances. That is, Chicano students do, by and large, have an opportunity to speak to a teacher or counselor about going to college but the most critical elements in their decision about whether or where to go are money and peer influence. It is fair to assume that the "distance from home" problem is closely tied to financial considerations and that finances are, from the student's perspective, the most important factor in choosing a college.[1] The student's

[1]Whether or not to "go away to college" is a particularly significant dilemma for the Chicano student. The family may want the student to

view is strongly supported by data on EOP students. In the UC system, 72% of the Chicanos are on EOP; in the California State University and Colleges, system 43.9% are EOP; and in the Community Colleges, 23.5% of the Chicanos are EOP.[1] Thus, it is quite obvious that any cutback in EOP funds would impact very heavily on Chicano students.

D. Counselors and Peer Influence

In discussing the factors which influence the Chicano student's decision about college, it must be remembered that many suffer "academic difficulties" in the high schools.[2] Thus college is often not seen by these students as a possibility, owing both to peer pressure and their academic problems. EOP and similar programs in the colleges do, of course, make high school academic difficulties less of a barrier to attending college than in the past. The point, however, is that helping many Chicano students decide which college to attend must be preceded by getting them to even regard college as a viable future alternative. A key person in accomplishing this difficult task must be the high school counselor.

As we have shown, the results of our written survey of Chicano students indicates that the high school counselor is often the first, and usually the most consistent, source of information and inspiration about

---

go to a college at home, for both financial and cultural reasons. The student may in fact accept these pressures as legitimate, and yet feel that "going away to college" is an important factor in personal growth. Sometimes Chicano students feel the need to get away from the family so as to be able to concentrate on academic matters rather than family problems.

[1] "Educational Opportunity Programs in California Public Higher Education: 1969-70," Council Report 71-5, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, April 1971.

[2] John H. Burma, Mexican-Americans in the United States, a reader (Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), pp. 91 ff.

attending college. Ideally, this is desirable, since counselors are often highly capable people whose job it is to know about college opportunities for their high school students. In fact, however, as the entry rates of Chicanos into college prove, many counselors enjoy only very limited success in getting Chicano students into college.

The reasons for this limited success are numerous. The most commonly stated reason for these difficulties is that counselors often have many hundreds of students in their "case load." This means very little time is available for the kind of individual and in-depth counseling Chicano students may require. As a result, counselors often work most successfully with those students who have long ago decided upon going to college, and are interested only in answers to the relatively easy questions having to do with which college to attend and how to get in. As we have noted, many Chicano students must first be convinced of the possibility and desirability of attending college--a difficult, frustrating, and time-consuming process.

While no exact figures are available, the vast majority of counselors in the State's high schools are not themselves Chicanos.[1] This means that their knowledge of the factors influencing Chicano students' decisions about college are limited, and where it exists, the result of ad hoc experiences and individual initiative. Thus counselors, a potentially vital source in motivating these students toward college, are not as successful as they might be with improved understanding of their students.

---

[1]Del Buono Memorandum, Appendix D. This is another example in which the absence of information on factors affecting the education of Chicanos has major consequences. In answering our inquiry into how many Chicano counselors there are in the public high schools, the State Department of Education was found to use gross figures that really demonstrated "how many there aren't."

A third factor that influences, often negatively, the ability of counselors to successfully orient their Chicano students toward college flows from the fact that our high schools are dominated by the principal. Whatever the wisdom of this fact of rather unlimited autocratic power, it means that principals must really support counselors very aggressively for a counselor to be successful. The principal's opposition or neutrality can be devastating. The administrative red tape counselors often face in making home visitations, bringing college representatives onto campus, or taking high school students to college campuses for site visits, were often discussed with us with a great deal of frustration and even anger. Our intent is not to make principals out to be the "bad guys," but rather to make it clear that the fact of their unusual power means that a counselor's effectiveness is directly related to the active support he receives from his principal. Consequently, the principal exercises as much influence over the destiny of the Chicano student as any other single individual.

A fourth major factor which often limits counselor effectiveness is that there is, with some notable exceptions, no systematic method for providing counselors with information about educational opportunities for their Chicano students. When that knowledge does exist, it is usually limited to the colleges and universities near the high school, and to those institutions with which the counselor has had particular personal experience. Thus, the counselor may, on his own initiative or that of a particular college representative, know something about college opportunities for his Chicano students, but that knowledge is almost always limited to a very small number of institutions.

Peer influence is a very substantial factor in determining Chicano students' decisions about which college to attend, or if, in fact, they

should go to college at all. The peer influence factor works with Chicanos in essentially the same way as that same factor works on any student. The students strongly influence one another in deciding first, whether or not to go to college, and assuming an affirmative decision, which college to attend. It is quite common to see Chicano students on a given campus who have known one another prior to entering higher education. Geographical determinants are important in the sense that it is often the nearest campus to which students will go. If, however, one student is enrolled on a campus that requires moving away from home, it is common for him or her to convince others from the same community to select the same institution. This generality tends to hold even if the students are separated by a year or more. When the student who has already had some experience in an institution has had a positive experience, it is even more probable that that student will be able to convince others from his community to follow suit.

An area where the peer influence can be affected is when that influence comes into conflict with the desires of a student's parents. Many Chicano parents are reluctant to approve of their children moving away from home. There are, of course, a good many reasons for this but before discussing some of them, it is very important to qualify this discussion. Too many people both in high schools and in colleges (counselors, recruiters, etc.) stereotype all Chicanos in this category. It is not unusual to hear people talk of the difficulty they have convincing parents to allow their youngsters to move away from home and this is an especially common expression as it refers to young women. While it must be conceded that this parental concern is more common among Chicanos than it is among the rest of the community, it is by no means a universal attitude. It is, in fact, a minority of Chicano parents who strongly resist the idea of their children

going away to college. Because of the difficulty this attitude has sometimes caused, however, and because this parental attitude is not as visible among Black and Anglo students, it is often assumed to be near universal for Chicanos.

Still, it is true that some Chicano parents prefer their sons and daughters to be near home. In some cases they insist upon it. They often do not trust the educational institution. They read the newspapers and magazines and watch on television all of the stories surrounding mixed or coed dormitories. They hear about drug problems on the campuses. They have watched and read about student demonstrations and some of the consequences surrounding those that have resulted in violence. They know that attending college is tremendously expensive and they see young people going into debt for their education. And then they read or hear about the tremendous unemployment among college graduates and they begin to wonder about the worthiness of it all. It is often a combination of these and other factors that heavily influence parental attitudes. The most common manifestation of parental reservations is that the parents insist that their youngsters attend school near home or better still within commuting distance.

Another area of potential conflict between Chicano parents and the attendance of Chicanos in higher education revolves around economics. While there is no data available on this phenomenon to provide us with precise information, there are some statements that can be made as a consequence of our experience and the experience of others who are concerned with Chicanos in higher education who have become interested in this aspect. Economic factors tend to affect the older children the most. That is, Chicano parents may mention that if the youngster goes to work, he or she can assist the family's economic situation. When there is a low family income and when

there are younger siblings, the older children feel an obligation to go to work to help relieve the pressure on their parents. It is important to emphasize here that it is the young man or woman who puts pressure on him- or herself to try to provide immediate economic assistance to the family. That is, the youngster perceives it as a responsibility that he or she has and not as something that is dictated by the parents. We have seen these students confronted by the suggestion that a person's earning power goes up measurably with a college degree and that if they wait for four years or so, they can help their family even more. The response is normally one that simply states, "Sure, I can survive for that amount of time, but what about the family?"

E. Policy Recommendations Regarding the Chicano and High Schools

1. Except for occasional coordination between a few campuses in the University of California system, the recruitment of Chicano students by colleges and universities is haphazard and does not reflect any systematic planning between campuses of sectors of higher education. Some campuses recruit these students from their nearby communities; others cover various sections of the State. Some high schools reported seldom seeing a college recruiter. For that reason, we believe that a plan for recruiting Chicano students must be developed that guarantees that all Chicano students will have at least heard about college first-hand.

We recommend the development of a statewide recruitment program for Chicano students in which every public college is given a nearby geographical area where it must work with the local high schools to inform their Chicano students about college opportunities. The responsibility for distributing information must be allocated so that all high schools with Chicano students

in the State are guaranteed to receive information and representatives from at least one of their nearby colleges from each of the three systems of public higher education. The college recruitment programs should not be restricted solely to the assigned high schools, and they should therefore be free to go wherever they choose in seeking Chicano students. However, this coordination of college institution and high schools in a given geographical area must occur if collegiate access for Chicanos is to be anything but haphazard.

As a part of this plan, the high schools in an assigned area should be required to supply local colleges with a list of the names and mailing addresses of all their Chicano students. This system, which is currently being used by the local high schools and the University of California at Riverside, will permit colleges to aggressively pursue bringing Chicano students on campus and to begin informing the student about his college opportunities very early in his high school career.

It is important to note that this process is designed to maximize Chicano students gaining access to information at least about opportunities at local or nearby institutions. It does not imply that Chicano students' options should be limited to these institutions nor does it imply that college recruiters be limited to nearby areas. It does, however, suggest that public institutions of higher education, regardless of their status nationally or internationally, have a responsibility to their local communities.

2. Teachers and high school counselors are currently among the most criticized professionals in our society. It is not necessary for us to assault their integrity or commitment to indicate that most of them are in drastic need of training regarding the Chicano student and his educational potential. We believe such training should be absolutely mandatory for all

school counselors, even if their major emphasis is "vocational" counseling.[1] This training should include at least the following three components: the methods for recognizing educational potential among Chicano students; a discussion and analysis of the cultural and personal factors affecting Chicanos' attitudes and decisions about higher education; and a description of existing college opportunities for Chicano students. With reference to recognizing potential among Chicano students, it should be mentioned that the high success rate of EOP students in California's colleges demonstrates that students doing badly in high school often are much more "successful" in college.[2]

3. We have been somewhat impressed with the structure and objectives of Berkeley's College Commitment Program. Under that program, forty university students work with local high school students who are potentials for EOP. We recommend the establishment of courses where college students receive credit for working with Chicano high school students in helping the latter understand and prepare for their college opportunities. In addition to the public service aspects of such a course, if properly managed, it could clearly be a very positive educational experience for college students in such disciplines as sociology, education and psychology, regardless of their own ethnic backgrounds.

---

[1] Intelligence and creativity manifest themselves in many different ways, which are often criticized by the majority society. We have found EOP and Upward Bound Programs where the complexity and sophistication of a high school student's mischievousness was recognized to be a sign of intelligence. Once the potential is recognized, the question is always whether or not it can be redirected so as to help the student succeed in college.

[2] Council Report 71-5, April 1971; and Marguerite J. Archie, "The Successes, Failures, and Future of Minority Programs in California," a speech given at the West College Association Meeting in San Jose, California, March 16 and 17, 1972 (mimeographed).

PART III

ADMISSIONS - FINANCIAL AID AND CHICANO STUDENTS

A. The College Scene

The college campus is often perceived by Chicano students as something akin to a foreign country. While the character of expectancy in the Chicano community is certainly in constant flux, and while higher education as an expectancy is no longer nearly as alien as it was a mere five years ago, the Chicano student can normally be characterized as one who had not always planned to go to a college or university. In fact one can say that the average Chicano student has only recently begun to think about higher education--sometimes as late as the senior year in high school.[1]

The social distance between the Chicano student and the rest of the campus is far greater than whatever distances were present in secondary school. Under most circumstances the Chicano student is in a far greater numerical minority than he or she was before. Moreover, if the Chicano college student is one who has had to move away from home, the alienation

---

[1] In our survey of recent high school graduates and college students who had completed one year, we asked how the respondents felt that students could best be informed of college opportunities (Q. 8). More advance notice, especially before the senior year, was the response volunteered by 16.5% of the recent high school graduates and 21.7% of those who had some college experience.

Personal experience with Chicano students reinforces this point even more strongly. Career orientation is often very vague with many students who, because of their recent decision to enter higher education, perceive higher education as a goal in itself; that is, getting a college education is a trauma since it is a new factor in their lives and survival in it is more important than whatever follows.

is intensified. The average Chicano high school student lives in a neighborhood that is dominantly Chicano and very often goes to a high school that has a significant number of Chicano students. When he or she goes to a campus of higher education the proportion of Chicano students as well as the absolute number is smaller; the total number of students is most often larger; and very often the Chicano student will be living in an area that is predominantly Anglo. This places an added burden of adjustment on the Chicano student.

When the Chicano student arrives on campus there are other problems to be faced. Many Chicano students on four-year campuses are EOP students. What does this mean in terms of survival?

The Educational Opportunity Programs enjoy a variety of characteristics and experiences.[1] In many cases, EOP is really the critical factor that determines whether or not a Chicano will have access to higher education. Whatever anyone might say about these controversial programs, it is a fact that without EOP there would be an even more miniscule number of Chicanos on college campuses. It is also true that the supportive services provided by EOP for their students have been a critical factor in the retention and success rate of Chicanos in higher education. Yet, for a number of reasons, EOP and EOP students are too often relegated to second class status on the campus. It is important to note that EOP enjoys different status on

---

[1] Council Report 71-5 is available at its source. This report includes a history of EOP and a description of the funding and services for the three systems of public higher education in the State. The findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the report are consistent with our own. Also, it presents a far more comprehensive analysis of Educational Opportunity Programs than our limited time and resources would allow.

different campuses and that negative perceptions of the programs, while far from unusual, are definitely not universal.

What are some of the perceptions and how do they affect Chicano students? The most common negative view is that students on EOP are not qualified and that they are beneficiaries of a lowering of collegiate standards.[1] An EOP student may be one who, on a UC campus for example, barely did not meet the A through F requirements. This is hardly a head-on collision with standards. Yet the image of the non-achiever associated with special or different admissions persists. Because it is fairly common knowledge that EOP is largely responsible for minorities on campus, there is the frequent experience of the non-EOP Chicano immediately being labeled as an EOP student simply because he or she is a Chicano. On some campuses, by some people, whether faculty, student, or administrator, such an assumption borders on (if it isn't in fact) being a pejorative remark. On several occasions EOP people have remarked that the image of EOP is so poor among some people that they often have a difficult time getting EOP students to come to the office or to avail themselves of the services offered.[2] Apparently the negative image is so bad in these instances that using the supportive services of the program is perceived as demeaning. It is certainly a tragedy that such views would persist around campuses where "regular" students support and sometimes make very wealthy those private firms that sell notes, term papers, etc. Why the latter is perceived as clever (not to mention the kinds of services that fraternal and sororal organizations

---

[1] See p. IV-6 of the Council Report 71-5, available at source, for an example of this.

[2] Ibid. This problem was also mentioned by the Director of EOP, California State University, Fresno, California.

have reputedly provided for their members) while making use of legitimate services is perceived as demeaning is indicative of the double standard used by some people when Chicanos and other minority groups are involved.

Thus when the Chicano student arrives on the college campus there are several things that can be said about his or her situation. First, the Chicano student is usually in a more conspicuous minority than ever before. Second, on the four-year campuses, the majority of Chicanos are EOP students and this can often lead to further alienation particularly on those campuses where the EOP is widely deprecated. And finally, it is too often true that all minorities are perceived as being on the campus under special consideration and therefore, by inference, not "really" qualified. All of these factors contribute to a general alienation of the Chicano student from the rest of the campus community. It must be emphasized here that this alienation is on top of the alienation that is common with most college students regardless of their ethnicality. Chicano students share the satisfactions and frustrations that all other students experience, in addition to those related to their ethnicality.

B. Visitations to Campuses of Higher Education

This part of the study is in many ways one of the more important segments of our activity this summer. The design of the visits included interviews with five administrators and fifteen Chicano students at each campus. There were to be nine campuses visited. Because this took place during the summer we encountered some logistical problems. Many of the administrators to whom we would have spoken otherwise were on vacation and very often it was difficult for our liaisons on the campuses to bring together a group of students because so many were not on campus. Our liaisons

were extremely helpful however, and the people to whom we were able to speak were willing contributors to our study. (See Appendix B.)

The plan was to visit three campuses from each system of public higher education but because so many people knew that the study was in progress we were able to talk to people from more campuses than were included in our plan. The people with whom we spoke were different on every campus. Their positions included deans, assistant deans, counselors, EOP directors, directors of special programs or services, admissions people, financial aid personnel, vice chancellors, assistants to vice chancellors, special assistants to the chancellor, residence hall personnel and classified personnel. The students with whom we spoke included those just beginning their college career, those midway, those finishing their B.A. or B.S., graduate students and students in professional schools. Some of the students were enjoying their experience in higher education and others felt that the campus had little or nothing to offer them.

The format for the visits was a very unstructured one. The interviewer met with a group or an individual depending on the circumstances and conducted an open-end discussion. The questions were highly generalized in an effort to have the direction of the conversation dictated by the people on the campus. The intention here is clear: Have the people on the campus decide what is important and not the interviewer. The introduction normally included a statement by the interviewer explaining the purpose of the study followed by something like the following:

> Only a few years ago there were very few Mexican-Americans or Chicanos on any campus in the State. Today there are sufficient numbers of Chicanos on virtually every campus in the State to constitute a visible minority. What does the presence of these students mean to your campus? What does this presence mean to higher education in general?

In some instances the reaction was a loud silence. When this occurred and when prompting along these lines yielded very little, the next question was essentially this:

> If you were in my situation, that is, with the advantage of being able to recommend on a policy level to the Legislature--what would you recommend in re Chicanos?

And if this question did not get any response the next question always was:

> Suppose for the sake of discussion that those of us in this room had total and absolute power to do as we wished with higher education or anything that impacted on it. What are some of the things we would discuss in re Chicanos?

Almost all of the interviews with administrators or counselors either began with or moved rapidly into the area of finances. Most were quick to agree that their institution could, given the appropriate amount of funding, either eliminate or minimize any problem in re Chicanos, whether or not they considered the problem areas real or imagined.

The strongest implication that can be drawn from the comment that an increase in funds was necessary to effect positive changes in the institution to facilitate the Chicano experience is that those people who made the comment feel that they have a good idea what solutions are needed. Judging from what was said there is no reason to disbelieve this. Most people (students and professionals alike) agreed that it was very unfortunate that today many of the professional people on campus do not know how to deal with Chicano students. Thus, it is commonly felt that more of the professional positions (administrators, counselors, etc.) should be filled with Chicanos or those who have a facility to relate to Chicano students.[1] This assumes that there

---

[1]See Table V-A, Part V of this report, for a breakdown of the number of Chicanos and their level of employment in California's three systems of public higher education.

are positions to be filled. The turnover rate for this kind of position is not high, however, and without additional FTEs, there is little possibility of improvement in the near future.

There was also the expressed need for additional Chicano faculty. The number of Chicanos available to fill faculty positions is not an enormous one and campuses find themselves in intense competition for the most desirable faculty candidates. There has been an increase in recruitment of Chicano faculty from out of State, but budget limitations in California have created a disadvantage for our State in this regard that is growing in proportion.

The issue that was raised over and over again was the shortage of student support funds. This was mentioned in general terms of financial aid resources as well as being mentioned as a very strong and sometimes dramatic plea that the State be more aggressive in supporting EOP.

There was a marked distinction between Chicano's (students and staff) comments and the comments of the other interviewees. First, Chicanos, particularly students, asserted again and again that more Chicano faculty and staff were necessary if the institutions are ever to effectively accept Chicanos on campus. The Chicano students acknowledged that it does not necessarily follow that a Chicano staff member is better able to relate to them. But the probability that this is so is much higher than otherwise. In at least one case this preference for Chicano staff has created potential inconvenience for Chicano students. They often have a long wait to see the Chicano staff member whereas they would have only a brief wait if they were to see someone else. The Chicanos on the campus insist that this is a consequence of the history of insensitivity by so many staff members who they feel showed something akin to resentment when dealing with Chicanos. The

Chicanos on campus were firm in their feeling that this type of phenomenon could only be minimized or eliminated by increasing the number of Chicanos in staff positions. Such a move would not only tend to provide the Chicano students with a choice but would also provide other staff members with additional resource persons who could assist in clearing up confusion and unnecessary stereotyping.

Another distinction in perspective between Chicanos and others on campus is the claim by non-Chicano staff that genuine efforts have been made to hire Chicanos. While most Chicanos will argue that there are people on the staff who are sincere on this issue, they believe that there are many others who are not. Chicanos argue that evidence of this is manifest in the miniscule number of Chicanos being hired for those billets that are open.

An interesting observation about the discussions with the Chicano students on the various campuses visited is the tremendous variation in types of students, in their attitudes with respect to their experiences, and in what they believe needs to be done. Student ideas were fairly uniform; more Chicano faculty, staff and especially counselors and the ubiquitous statement, more financial aid so that more students could be admitted. One thing that the Chicanos on campuses recognize that others are just beginning to note is the need for a bicultural-bilingual curriculum in the lower schools to more effectively start positive reinforcement with respect to education in general and higher education in particular. The thrust here is one Chicanos have argued for a long time. That is, a bicultural-bilingual approach in the early years will alter what has too often been an alienating experience and redirect primary and secondary school into a more positive posture with regard to the Chicano community.

The role of higher education in the establishment of an early bicultural-bilingual approach is clear. Teachers and administrators are trained in institutions of higher education. Too often teachers in the lower schools are educationally handicapped because they have not had the proper training in the process of attaining their credentials. This educational handicap can only be overcome if teachers in California are required to learn Spanish as well as being required to learn something about the culture of the Spanish speaking population in the State. As one student aptly stated, when a Chicano youngster starts school, he or she enters with the base for understanding two languages and two cultures that are indigenous to this State. The teachers and other school personnel almost universally are restricted to one language and one culture and can best be described as being unprepared to deal with their students, often to the point of being unable to communicate except in the most primitive of fashions. The onus for establishing a basis for communication is placed on the shoulders of five-year-olds. The adult in the relationship who happens also to be a college graduate is absolved of responsibility. The situation of the Chicano youngster, that of being forced to deal with the educationally and culturally handicapped teacher, persists throughout his or her educational experience. It is a wonder that any Chicanos survive at all. This communication problem persists into institutions of higher education. Chicano college students often need tutors to survive but it doesn't seem out of the realm of practicality that personnel employed by institutions of higher education should also have tutors to provide them with the necessary knowledge to deal effectively with Chicano students.

Another area mentioned by both students and staff is that of graduate opportunities. They asserted that the amount of financial aid available

to Chicanos (or others for that matter) is simply insufficient. The State requires graduate work for teaching, counseling and many other professional areas if a person is to be credentialed and/or licensed. Yet, there is very little money put up by the State for graduate student financial aid. There were a variety of suggestions here, including grants, internships, and more guaranteed loans.

The site visits did, however, demonstrate that some changes have taken place. Five years ago one could travel across the State and visit all of the universities and four-year colleges in California and see very little of a Chicano presence among student bodies. There were very probably fewer than twenty-five hundred Chicano students on all of the four-year campuses combined (public and private). Today that number is vastly increased. A major disappointment five years ago would have been to traverse the State's Community Colleges and see how very few Chicanos there were on those campuses. While there were more Chicanos in Community Colleges than in four-year institutions, there was a fantastic concentration of Chicanos in non-academic fields and even then the total number was a mere shadow of what is evident today.

Five years ago it was possible for someone to know every Chicano who worked on a professional level in higher education. In fact, it was possible to know everyone fairly intimately. Today that is still nearly possible. Chicano student enrollment has grown tremendously but the same cannot be said of Chicanos on the professional level in higher education.[1] True,

---

[1]See Part II for enrollment figures. We do not present rate of growth in Chicano student enrollment over a period of time because it seems inconsequential. Quite simply we are faced with the reality that there are too few Chicanos in higher education today. To demonstrate with data that the situation is improving or deteriorating is meaningless. The only evidence that

from the standpoint of percentages one might be able to argue a dramatic increase but that can be very deceptive. Statistics indicating a 100% or even 300% growth often mean an increase of only two or three people. Yet another disappointment in this area is the lack of presence of Chicanos in what might be termed "line" positions. That is, those positions where Chicanos might accumulate the necessary experience to eventually assume some of the very highest offices on campuses. It is as if people are deliberately not grooming young Chicano administrators for anything except terminal posts.

In general terms, attitudes toward Chicanos vary considerably. In some cases there is a genuine acceptance of Chicanos on campus as a positive element, even to the point where staff and others have a difficult time perceiving Chicanos on campus as an issue. On other campuses there seems to be the attitude that any Chicano on campus should be grateful for the opportunity given to him or her and not offer any complaints since they are only there by the good graces of some paternalistic soul who chose to be nice. To this latter group a Chicano is still a foreigner and it doesn't matter that the Chicano might be a fourth or fifth generation Californian--a Chicano by not being Anglo is simply not one hundred percent American.

In this study we did not have as an objective the enumeration of specific instances and/or examples of discrimination. An attitudinal survey would constitute a separate research project and in our own activity we did not assume the presence of overt manifestations of discrimination. In our own experience both within and without the context of the present study

---

we can have of adequate opportunity or access to higher education for Chicanos is a reasonably proportionate representation of Chicanos on the campuses.

we have found a low incidence of occurrence of blatant discrimination or inflammatory racial or ethnic remarks. This type of discrimination does, of course, still exist. The remark of one of the college students responding to our survey illustrates this point. The respondent attributed the following statement to a professor (the context of the statement was not clear): "Mexican-American students are born stupid, so when you begin teaching, don't be overly concerned with these children. Place all your emphasis with the upper-class and middle-class white child."

What are some of the things that must be done in the near future to guarantee that the distance between the institution and Chicanos becomes smaller rather than larger? There must be parity in employment that reflects in reasonable terms the community the institution serves; male and female counselors must be hired on all campuses with a significant number of Chicanos whose special expertise is working with Chicano students; executive officers of the various branches and institutions of public higher education must publicly support minority programs; and Chicanos in administration in higher education must be given adequate opportunity to progress into some of the more responsible positions on campuses.

On this last point it is important to take note of a recent phenomenon. Some Chicanos as well as other minorities have been hired as "special assistants" to executive officers.[1] In order for them to function effectively they have had to learn about nearly all aspects of the institution. These positions, however, because they tend to involve the individuals in many ad hoc activities, are placing these people in a situation that lacks definition within a normal administrative matrix. As a consequence those Chicanos who

---

[1]Examples of this phenomena do exist or have existed at the University campuses of Santa Barbara and Los Angeles, and at San Bernardino City College, among others.

have taken the special assistant positions are locked into their jobs and get limited credit for the experience. When their special assistance is no longer required, what will become of them?

C. Admissions and Financial Aid

The very high percentage of Chicano students entering college who are financially disadvantaged requires that problems of admissions and financial aid be understood jointly. It must be remembered that Chicanos are the most financially disadvantaged ethnic group in the State. The recent United States census shows that 58% of the Spanish surnamed households in urban sections of Los Angeles County have a total family income of less than $10,000 per year.[1] In this context, the fact that the financial needs of a Community College student living at home has been estimated at approximately $1,700[2] annually becomes a striking illustration of how financial need is perhaps the single most important barrier to dramatically increasing the number of Chicanos attending our colleges and universities. We believe that it is dramatically illustrative of the extreme significance of the costs of attending college to note that despite the "open admissions" of the Community Colleges, the percentage of Chicano students in their total day-student body continues to hover around 7.9%.[3] If the financing for student aid and other support services is made available, we will see a dramatic increase in Chicano student enrollment.

---

[1] "Family Income," Census Tabulation No. 75, 1970 Census, U.S.A.

[2] Sidney Brossman, "Statement to the California Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education," April 26, 1972, p. 2.

[3] Table II, Racial & Ethnic Enrollments in California Community College Districts (Apprentices, Day Students, and Comparative K-12 Public School Students (Fall 1969 & 1970).

There have been numerous reports and statements in the last three years pertaining to admissions and financial aid for Chicano students.[1] In reviewing this material and in obtaining information from Chicano students and faculty during the preparation of our report, we have decided to emphasize the following conclusions:

1. The academic success of the EOP student in our colleges and universities is perhaps the single most important factor to be considered in future collegiate policy directed at increasing the number of Chicano students enrolled in the State's higher education systems.

2. A very large percentage of the Chicano students who are in college through procedures other than the EOP route are making use of student support services (non-financial aid such as tutoring and peer counseling) and are greatly benefiting from those services.

3. An extremely high percentage of Chicano students in the University system are there through EOP (in excess of 70% as compared to 40-50% in the State University and Colleges system). While the admission requirements of the University of California system make this understandable, it is somewhat ironic when we consider the fact that the retention rate of EOP students at the University of California seems to be slightly better than for EOP students at the State University and Colleges campuses, though the rates are remarkably good in both systems. In addition, there seems to be only a relatively small difference between the median GPA of all undergraduates at the University of California (2.87 in 1970-71) and the median GPA of EOP students at the University (2.56). The fact is that a high percentage of students defined as "academically unqualified" under the normal admission standards of the University of California are doing well. We believe this clearly demonstrates the inappropriateness of the current standards used in considering Chicano students for "normal admissions" into the University system.

4. There is ample evidence (as illustrated in #3 above and in referenced Council Report 71-5), that at the present time EOP programs are clearly the best and most practical mode for expanding Chicano access.

---

[1] Council Report 71-5; Marguerite J. Archie speech, "The Successes, Failures, and Future of Minority Programs in California"; Dr. Kenneth S. Washington, et al., "Statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education," (Appendix F).

D. Recommendations Regarding Admissions and Financial Aid

1. To reasonably increase the number of Chicano students attending institutions of public higher education in this State, there must be financial support for an expanded Educational Opportunity Program. This is particularly true in the University of California system where so high a number of Chicano students enter through the EOP route.

2. Monies must be provided to make the EOP student support services (counseling, etc.) available to all Chicano students, including those enrolled through the "normal procedures." The importance of these services to Chicano students is discussed in the following section.

3. The number of Chicanos receiving awards from the State Scholarship and Loan Program must be expanded. This can be accomplished via several modes: either by providing a larger appropriation to the Commission in such a way that there is a focus on Chicanos in the delivery system; by more active recruitment of applicants from schools with a heavy concentration of Chicanos; or by establishing a separate program for students going into particular careers. On this latter point, advantage might be given to students who indicate a commitment to work in barrio schools as teachers, administrators, or counselors. Deference might also be shown to those students who are bilingual or willing to cultivate bilinguality as a tool to be used for working in the Chicano community. See Council Report 71-5 for information on current loan program distribution.

4. The percentage of Chicanos who receive funds under the College Opportunity Grant (COG) program is satisfactory, but the entire program must be expanded. The advantages of receiving grants under this program (a four-year grant that students may take with them if they transfer from one

institution to another) make it an all-important source of financing Chicano students in higher education.

5. Traditional admissions criteria such as high school achievement and aptitude tests must be completely eliminated for Chicano students. New standards for measuring collegiate potential among Chicano students must be developed through an evaluation of the characteristics of Chicanos who are currently successful in college (most notably EOP students) and through other procedures discussed more fully in the concluding chapter.

6. These new standards for measuring academic potential among Chicano students must be applied so that any Chicano student, applying to any college or university of any public system who meets these standards shall be admitted to that campus. This proposal is discussed more fully in the concluding chapter.

7. An on-going reporting procedure from the EOP projects of all three systems to the Coordinating Council must be established so that important information and data on the experiences of these efforts are readily available.

PART IV

ETHNIC STUDIES PROGRAMS

Only a few years ago ethnic study as we presently know it was non-existent in California's system of public higher education. Today, it has impacted on virtually every campus. On some campuses it is very strong (there are degree programs) and on others it is barely perceptible (one or two courses). In this section we will enumerate the Chicano Studies Programs in the State. We will also address ourselves to some of the questions that surround these often controversial programs and course offerings.

All of the campuses of the UC system have either a Chicano Studies Program, or offer a number of courses on Chicanos through regular departments or a center.[1] See Appendix H for "Some Notes on Standards for Chicano Studies."

Two campuses offer a major in Chicano Studies: Berkeley and Riverside. At both of these campuses a person may either get their B.A. in Chicano Studies or have a joint or concurrent major with another field. Students may concentrate in Chicano Studies at Irvine under a major in Comparative Cultures or at San Diego in either Third World Studies or Spanish Literature.

The Chicano Studies Program at Santa Barbara offers a wide range of courses in Chicano Studies (Spanish, History, Political Science, Psychology

---

[1] Data on the UC campuses are from catalogues, a report to Assemblyman John Vasconcellos from the Vice President-Academic Affairs for the University of California (July 3, 1972) in response to ACR 78 and a memorandum from the Office of Academic Affairs of the University of California (July 18, 1972).

and Literature) as does UCLA which offers courses both through the Chicano Studies Center and through various departments.

The Davis Campus also offers courses through the Chicano Studies Program and various departments. Individual colleges at Santa Cruz offer a regular array of courses that deal with Chicanos and College VII, which is just getting started, will pay particular attention to Chicanos within its general theme of problems of the cities and minorities.

The San Francisco campus, which is primarily concerned with graduate level training in the health sciences, offers several courses with an ethnic focus including a course on the Spanish Speaking Subcultures in Sociology.

In the California State University and College system there are eight campuses with a full B.A. degree program and one with an M.A. degree program in Mexican-American Studies.[1] The campuses with a B.A. program are the following:

Fullerton	Northridge
Hayward	San Diego
Long Beach	San Francisco
Los Angeles	Sonoma

San Jose State University offers the M.A. in Mexican-American Studies. Sacramento State University offers a B.A. in Ethnic Studies with a concentration in Chicano Studies as one of the options.

Minors or emphases in Chicano Studies are offered at Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Pomona and San Bernardino. In addition to this, Bakersfield, Stanislaus, and San Luis Obispo offer courses in Chicano Studies through various departments (e.g., History, Spanish, Sociology). Humboldt

---

[1] Data are from a Report from Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke to Dr. Owen A. Knorr, Director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (July 6, 1972) in response to ACR 78 and from survey accomplished for this study.

is presently working on the development of a program similar to the one at Sacramento although this is still at an early stage.

Thus, while there is a tremendous range of variety there are offerings in Chicano Studies or courses with an emphasis on Chicanos on every campus. Those campuses with degree programs clearly have a greater number of courses and alternatives in programs for the students.

A May, 1972 survey showed that every Community College in the State had at least one course which presented information on ethnic minorities.[1] Among the Community College districts there were four which offered one course per college; twelve districts offered two courses per college; fifty-one districts offered three or more courses per college and one district indicated eighty-five courses. Among these there were eighteen Community Colleges with at least twelve semester units in Mexican-American Studies and six that offered programs in ethnic studies with Chicano Studies as a component. In addition there are three programs in Mexican-American studies that are at different stages of development or projected for the next academic year.

It is clear that while some Community College districts are not moving along as rapidly as others, every such institution is doing something to bring ethnic or Chicano Studies into the curriculum. Since the implementation of ethnic studies in California Community Colleges only began in 1968 it is apparent that a good deal of progress has been made.

The data shows that there has been a dramatic growth of ethnic studies in general and Mexican-American or Chicano Studies in particular

---

[1]The data gathered are from the California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor.

throughout California's systems of public higher education. In a scant five years the public higher education in California has moved from a mere handful of courses throughout the State to many structured programs and hundreds of courses both within more established departments and within newer departments such as Ethnic Studies or Chicano Studies. The data, however, do not reveal the continuing division of opinion regarding these new academic programs and curricula.

Those of us who have been involved in the development and establishment of ethnic studies have been engaged in a continuous defense of the merits and/or utility of the programs and curricula.[1] People within and without academe have continuously challenged the academic legitimacy of these programs. Critical to keep in mind is that many of the people who do challenge the legitimacy of Chicano Studies are thoughtful individuals who sincerely find the need for Chicano Studies difficult to understand. It is in this context that the following discussion is presented. The argument is obviously one that favors Chicano Studies and the continued growth and development of Chicano Studies programs and curricula. It is a response and not an answer and is directed toward issues that were only reinforced and not initially raised while doing the research for this study.

Questions such as "Why Chicano Studies?" "What is it?" "How is it different?" "What does it offer?" "For whom does it offer it?" and "for what purpose?" are the types of queries that define the challenge to the legitimacy of Chicano Studies. This challenge to the legitimacy of Chicano

---

[1]Mr. Lopez was an active participant in the establishment of the Cultural Centers at UCLA and established and directed the Chicano Studies program at the Claremont Colleges. He has had ongoing communications and close relations with a number of the directors or administrative heads of Chicano programs across the State.

Studies is at once a defensive and an offensive approach to the subject. The defensive aspect to the challenge appears to have group ego determinants. Integral to the idea of Chicano Studies is the notion of preservation of culture. This desire for preservation in turn implies rejection of the majority culture or at the very least rejection of total assimilation into it. This rejection can be difficult to accept because it is often interpreted as a criticism or an accusation that there is something undesirable about the majority culture. It should be clear that the primary aspect of rejection that implies accusation is in the context of the majority culture's insistence on total assimilation. The desire and need for Chicano Studies has to do with preference. This preference is rooted in the thrust for a positive self-identity that assimilation processes negate. Thus the nature of the majority culture is of no genuine consequence in the choice Chicanos make for their own culture.

There is offense in the challenge to the legitimacy of Chicano Studies because the challenge implies doubt whether or not it is possible for the exclusive study of Chicanos to be as good as or as worthy as existing or "traditional" orientations. That is, it is worthwhile to study and understand the majority group because that is education and has to do with knowledge and the like. But, to study a group such as Chicanos (which numbers somewhere around ten million people today) simply is not sufficient and whatever could one learn in that situation that one cannot learn in studying the majority culture? The offensiveness here is in the rather strong implication that to know about the majority culture and to learn about the majority culture is to have direct access to knowledge and that any other approach is simply indirect or inadequate. It is essential to be aware of or sensitive to these aspects of the challenge to the legitimacy of Chicano Studies. The

most well-meaning intent and even the apparently innocent curiousness that prompts the challenge have these elements underlying them. Certainly the relative magnitude of these parameters varies with the inquirer but it can be assumed that these parameters are universally present in one degree or another. To attempt to deal with these questions without this acknowledgment would frustrate the possibility of establishing any real level of understanding and would reduce any explication or response to a non sequitur.

This type of question was probably not asked when Asian or Latin American Studies Programs were established. These are area studies that are studied wholly from the perspective of the majority culture here in the United States. There is no threat implied or explicit in the thrust of extranational studies such as there is in intranational studies. We are dealing therefore, in some part, with questions of nationalism, with questions of feelings of cultural superiority, with questions of free-choice and with questions of a desire for variety as a quality of life. Nor do these same questions arise in the same context or with the same profundity in discussions of other academic departments.

For the sake of argument, let us ask: "Why is economics taught outside of political science? Why are sociology and anthropology treated distinctly? What are the separations between these and history and philosophy?" One of the arguments that we usually encounter in discussions of Chicano Studies is in the form of the question, "couldn't these studies be carried out within the more traditional departments?" Is that same question then applicable to the various social sciences? Couldn't or shouldn't the social sciences that we presently have all be in one department or discipline?

Yet another common question is "what good would a degree in Chicano Studies be?" And there is the other very common query, "what can a person

do with such a degree?" or "what kind of a job would this person be prepared for?" These questions and many like them can be addressed by positing a question in response. Do these questions arise with the same frequency in regard to other academic departments? If a person is to ask a challenging question about Chicano Studies, then the criteria for the formulation of the question must be such that existing and rarely challenged academic activities can be similarly challenged. The inquirer should first satisfy him or herself that the answers to these questions directed at already established academic programs are readily available. Such an approach would reduce the discussion or enlarge it as the case may be into issues of the purpose of higher education, the intent of some of the disciplines (particularly the Social Sciences), and the real or practical value of a variety of courses of undergraduate study. Once the issue has evolved to that point, it is highly doubtful that there would be unequivocable or universally agreed upon resolution. Similarly, we will not have any pat answers for the why of Chicano Studies. Nor will those answers that are offered be of the type that can convince anyone that Chicano Studies is an absolute necessity. But then, what in higher education is an absolute necessity?

Defining Chicano Studies is also difficult because there is the implication that we know a great deal about Chicanos. What is known in a scientific way is extremely limited. Further, many of the scientific studies that have been made about Chicanos are so thoroughly culturally biased that it is nearly impossible to filter the signal from the noise from among these studies. Critical here, of course, are the limitations there are in understanding cross-cultural analysis. One necessarily uses his own cultural values as reference points when investigating another culture. The distortion is usually the result of the reference point being a critical value in the

investigator's own cultural matrix but not necessarily a critical value in the cultural matrix that is being studied. Thus, when attempting to describe an aspect of another culture there is the tendency to say that the people being studied do things more or less differently than we do the same thing.

The problem with this approach lies not with the specific comparison but rather with an accumulation of comparisons. The accumulation of critical points with the investigator's own culture as a reference creates a cultural configuration that may or may not be valid for the culture that is being studied. If, for example, we could describe our own cultural configuration as a perfect circle and if the culture being studied were also a perfect circle, then, given concentricity, we would have a valid approach. If, however, as is probably more approximate to the case, the two cultures have the relationship that a circle has to a hyperbolic paraboloid, then the problem makes a quantum jump in complexity. Under these circumstances one may still understand some specific relationships between the two cultures. However, a description of each of the cultures that maintains the integrity of each is necessary as a condition to establish a valid understanding of either with respect to the other. In the case of Mexican-American or Chicano Studies we are dealing with much the same problem. That is, there is sufficient information to establish that the relationship between the majority culture in the United States and Chicano culture is not linear. One might also speculate that it is presently within the realm of possibility to describe the majority culture within some limits but with essential accuracy. There is not, however, sufficient information for establishing a configuration of Chicano culture within a tolerance of confidence.

There is a need for a vast increase in the body of knowledge with regard to Mexican-Americans if the culture of Mexican-Americans is ever to

be understood. This body of knowledge must be built from within. That is, it must be constructed primarily by Chicanos in order to have the intellectual integrity that is critical to provide a basis for understanding the ultimate configuration that would legitimately represent the cultural matrix of Chicanos.

It is immensely more valuable to Chicanos than to anyone else that this be accomplished. There is no need to apologize for wanting to know one's self or wanting to know about one's roots, origins, or mystical underpinnings. Certainly there has been more than a casual effort by the majority culture in this society to satiate the desire to know about itself. Chicano Studies is an integral component of our nationality, that is, of the United States. It is interesting that given this fact there is so little interest on the part of the majority culture to find out about this particular component of their nationality. One can certainly question the intellectual integrity of the majority culture and in particular the academic community within that culture for ignoring a community as large and complex as the Mexican-American community. Given the very crude population figures that are available there are as many Mexican-Americans in the United States as there are total populations in at least fifteen separate states. There are in California alone as many Mexican-Americans as there are total number of people in at least ten states. Certainly we would not attempt to study the development or the history or the composition of this country by excluding any of these states. What types of common denominators are there in those various states that disallow us from excluding them from consideration? One might speculate that there are greater common bonds among Mexican-Americans despite geographic dispersion than there are within those individual states.

Given that as a possibility, the lack of scholarship in Chicano Studies seems even more extraordinary.

One might further speculate that familiarity with Chicano culture would provide an even greater understanding of the majority group in this country. Certainly the lack of familiarity with Mexican-Americans is a proportionate measure of lack of knowledge of the country. In a purely cultural sense one might increase his knowledge of the majority culture by virtue of the refractive qualities characteristic to Chicano culture. While it is true that among the major minority groups in this country the cultural distance between Chicanos and the majority culture is greatest, it is also true that Chicanos are essentially a product of Mexican culture and the majority of Anglo-Saxon culture. It would be very informative to understand the selection process that takes place when two cultures meet. Mexican-American Studies has by virtue of the size of its target population sufficient specificity to provide an opportunity for a thorough and in-depth acquisition of knowledge that is inter-disciplinary in nature. If there is significant realization of this potential then greater levels of understanding with respect to our whole society will be attainable.

While there are unquestionably many residual advantages that can be wrought from Chicano Studies it would be dishonest to suggest that that was its primary rationale for existence. Certainly preservation of culture is the strongest element in the desire for Chicano Studies. This desire for preservation of culture could be construed as a mere caprice. Such a conclusion, however, is invalid.

There is as much need among Chicanos for self-identity and preservation of culture as there is for any group. The need for cultural identity acts as a centripetal force and provides people with the psychological

stability that is essential for survival. The effect of this force is both inclusive and exclusive. The manifestation of the inclusive effect has been the development of folkways that are independent of formal education. The lack of a formal educational structure that is consonant with the culture has tended to break down that culture. The cultural integrity of Chicanos has not deteriorated as rapidly as the cultural integrity of other non-Anglo groups. The continuity resultant from the fact that most (90%) Mexican-Americans live in a geographic area that was not so long ago part of the mother country is a powerful but as of today indeterminant factor in the sustenance of the cultural integrity of the group. This is also true due to the proximity to the mother country and because of the constant flow of people back and forth across the border. The result of this phenomenon of a constant nurturing of the original culture and its simultaneous deterioration because of lack of institutional support has yielded a product culture that is unique to Chicanos. The lack of institutions for propagation and preservation of the culture has given it its exclusiveness. One might speculate that if the southern borders of the United States were closed to human traffic, Chicano culture would, after a period of time, disappear and Chicanos would meld into the majority cultural ways. Thus if the goal was to effect total assimilation of the Chicanos into the majority culture, either the geography or the laws of the land or both would have to be severely altered.

It is important to keep in mind that the Chicano culture is a culture within a culture. That the same types of centripetal force work on the majority culture and that given a relative status quo with regard to Mexican-United States relations we can expect differences to exist between Chicanos and the majority culture for some time to come. These differences and the

subsequent conflicts will exist not simply because the Chicano culture will struggle to survive but also because the majority culture will perceive the struggle for survival as a centrifugal or antipathetic vector with respect to its own dynamics.

So long as a majority culture perceives Chicano culture as a force that is pulling away from the center there will be conflict. This view will sustain itself as long as Chicano culture is ignored or perceived as non-existent. If on the other hand the majority culture accepts Chicano culture as an integral part of its whole and assists in its survival then it alters the direction of the force vector the Chicano culture presently represents in our society. Thus, if we have Chicano Studies we have a two-fold effect. First, we have a vehicle for the preservation of Chicano culture. Second, by admitting Chicano culture as a part of U.S. culture we convert it from a centrifugal to a centripetal force. This conversion translates the existence of a Chicano culture into a positive component of the whole.

A. Conclusions

To appropriately meet the needs of the Chicanos means we must have curriculum throughout our formal education that is consonant with the Chicano culture. We must also have the ability to train teachers to work effectively with Chicano youngsters. To provide curriculum and appropriate teacher training we need people in higher education who have the appropriate orientation and sensitivity to Chicano studies.

This matter, however, seems too important to leave to hope or chance. The establishment of Chicano Studies or related curricula on virtually every campus of public higher education in the State indicates a much brighter future than was evident four or five years ago. However, the establishment

of many of these programs was not the result of intellectual or academic motivations so much as it was political motivations. The abrupt proliferation of so many programs and the questionable motives for their establishment introduces a note of pessimism. What will happen as political exigencies begin to change? Hopefully there will be no attempt to reduce the number and size of the programs that are presently extant. Chicano Studies along with other ethnic studies programs are still very young in an academic sense and as a consequence it is very difficult to assess the quality of the programs and curricula in any genuinely conclusive way. Those of us who have had association or are associated with Chicano Studies realize that there remain many problem areas.

It is difficult, for example, to find adequately trained personnel to fill the faculty positions. While there is an increasing amount of literature available there are still too few choices in the general area of curricular materials. The sequential relationship between courses has not been finally resolved. There are very few graduate programs available to prepare people to work in Chicano Studies. California State University, San Jose, has an M.A. program and Chicano History is recognized as a field at UCLA but there are few institutions that have the faculty and consequently the capability of offering a comprehensive program for graduate students. Most of the Chicano Studies faculty today are individuals who tailored their graduate programs within a more established discipline to focus on Chicanos. Much of the stability of Chicano Studies curricula in the sense that courses from one institution are comparable to courses from other campuses are the result of ad hoc efforts by the Chicano faculty. These problem areas will diminish in size in proportion to the growth of constructive institutional support to systematize and regulate the growth and development of programs

and curricula on a system-wide (i.e., University of California, California State University and Colleges, California Community Colleges) basis.

Institutional support of Chicano Studies can take many forms. It is important to have the backing of the chief administrator of the system and each of the campuses. Formal acknowledgement of support for Chicano Studies will facilitate the constructive development of the programs. Individual campuses can establish and maintain Chicano faculty development programs in the form of financial support, modified teaching loads, and by encouraging the establishment of major fields within graduate departments.

We believe that the residual of local campus discretion as to whether or not courses about the Chicano should exist at the institution should be done away with and each system should establish a uniform policy requiring a minimum of such courses at every institution.[1] We recognize that there are institutions with few Chicanos on campus. We do believe, however, that even in these institutions a small number of courses that introduce the students to the experiences and successes of the Chicano should be made available.

B. Recommendations

1. Each of the three systems of California's public higher education develop and establish a uniform policy of minimal curricular offerings in Chicano Studies.
2. That the California State Teachers Credential include a Chicano Studies requirement.

---

[1]This type of requirement already exists for the California Community Colleges in the form of the Resolutions adopted February 20, 1969 and September 17, 1969, by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Appendix H).

3. That the administrative heads of each of the systems and of each institution publicly state their support for Chicano Studies curricula and/or programs.
4. That each of the systems establish a standing statewide committee to study and assess the needs of Chicanos and Chicano programs (akin to the UC President's Task Force).
5. That individual campuses be encouraged and supported in the establishment and maintenance of Chicano faculty development programs.

PART V

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Affirmative Action Programs on the campuses of California's systems of public higher education are among the most critical programs in the State. If public higher education is ever to achieve or approximate the goal of equal access and equal opportunity at all levels in higher education it is imperative that the ideals and goals of Affirmative Action Programs be fully realized. This is a complex area and it is one that in the context of the State's systems of public higher education deserves extensive study in itself. Each of the campuses in the State develops its own Affirmative Action Program. There are certainly many similarities among the various programs but there just as certainly are many differences. The similarities and differences are attributable to the type of campus (UC, California State University and Colleges, and Community Colleges), to the size of the campus, to its rate of growth, and to its present status in the context of Affirmative Action as well as other factors which are far more difficult to assess such as commitment to the ideals of the programs. In this study we will discuss the programs in general terms only and we can say at the outset that a more thorough analysis of Affirmative Action Programs is needed.

There seems to be little question that without employing such methods or guidelines as those provided for by Affirmative Action there would be little headway in the area of more equitable opportunity for Chicanos and

other minorities. The best evidence of the efficacy of the actions prompted by these programs is the growing visibility of the "white backlash" which is usually manifest in such statements as "preferential hiring practices constitute racism in reverse."[1] Indeed, by using the appropriate logic one can arrive at such a conclusion. What is too often ignored in these types of criticisms, however, is that what is taking place under the aegis of Affirmative Action Programs is really a reversing of the tide of racism or ethnocentricism used against Chicanos and other minorities. Reversing racism involves setting objectives and/or goals that are a basis for measuring progress. Reversing racist practices does not require setting quotas (which is so repugnant to so many people) but it does require altering the direction of events or working toward a reasonable and realistic objective of approximating parity in employment within reasonable bounds. Parity in employment simply means that the institution essentially reflects or is on a reasonable par in its population with the community it serves.

J. Stanley Pottinger defined the concept of Affirmative Action in the October, 1972 issue of Change very well:

> The concept of Affirmative Action requires more than mere neutrality on race and sex. It requires the university to determine whether it has failed to recruit, employ and promote women and minorities commensurate with their availability, even if this failure cannot be traced to specific acts of discrimination by university officials. Where women and minorities are not represented on a university's rolls, despite their availability (that is, where they are "under-utilized") the university has an obligation to initiate affirmative efforts to recruit and hire them.

---

[1] These refer to what has been a consistently present criticism or reservation about Affirmative Action as well as the more recent accusation leveled at the State's University and Colleges system by the Anti-Defamation League in a July, 1972 letter to the Chairman of the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges, Mr. George D. Hart. The statement in the above text is an example and not a direct quote and is meant as an illustration of the most apparent thrust of critics of Affirmative Action.

> The premise of this obligation is that systemic forms, forms of exclusion, inattention and discrimination cannot be remedied in any meaningful way, in any reasonable length of time, simply by ensuring a future benign neutrality with regard to race and sex. This would perpetuate indefinitely the grossest inequities of past discrimination. Thus there must be some form of positive action, along with a schedule for how such actions are to take place, and an honest appraisal of what the plan is likely to yield--an appraisal that the regulations call a "goal."

Mr. Pottinger's explanation of the purpose of having goals is also a cogent statement:

> --First, since a university cannot predict employment results in the form of goals without first analyzing its deficiencies and determining what steps are likely to remedy them, the setting of goals serves as an inducement to lay the analytical foundation necessary to guarantee nondiscrimination and the affirmative efforts required by the Executive Order.
>
> --Second, goals serve as one way of measuring a university's level of effort, even if not the only way. If a university falls short of its goals at the end of a given period, that failure in itself does not require a conclusion of noncompliance (as would be the case if quotas were in use). It does, however, signal to the university that something has gone awry, and that reasons for the failure should be examined. If it appears, for example, that the cause for failure was not a lack of defined effort or adherence to fair procedures, then we regard compliance to have taken place. Perhaps the university's original goals were unrealistically high in light of later job market conditions. Or perhaps it faced an unforeseen contraction of its employment positions, or similar conditions beyond its control. On the other hand, if the failure to reach goals was clearly a failure to abide by the Affirmative Action program set by the university, compliance <u>is</u> an issue, and a hearing is likely to ensue.

His reaction to those who make an issue of "goals" as a mode of criticizing Affirmative Action is consistent with our own reaction and is also very likely the feeling that many people secretly feel about negative reactions to Affirmative Action.

> Unfortunately, it is my impression that some critics who argue that goals are quotas are really not arguing against quotas at all. They understand the distinction between the two, and they understand that one need not inevitably become the other. Their insistence on crying "quota" to every discussion on Affirmative Action

> and their refusal to accompany their arguments with any alternatives that would appear to guarantee Affirmative Action without goals, lead to the conclusion that their real target is Affirmative Action itself.

What is surprising in fact is that public higher education is still a long, long way from reaching parity in employment (as well as in student enrollment). Yet, because there have been a few people hired into regular positions, essentially under the aegis of Affirmative Action, some groups are beginning to yell and whoop about "discrimination in reverse." Some people have even suggested that the only way to go about hiring Chicanos and other minorities is to obtain additional funds and manufacture special positions just to create a numbers balance. This is obviously patently contrary to the spirit of the law and of the Affirmative Action Programs. The thrust of the criticisms of minority hiring can be translated into the not so absurd conclusion that some people are in general agreement with minority hiring so long as minorities do not hold any of the regular or normal positions in the structure. These people seem to be arguing that it is fine to hire minorities so long as there are special funds and special positions.

An issue that is commonly raised is that one of qualified versus qualifiable candidates for a particular position. The primary distinction is that the qualifiable do not precisely meet the letter of the stated prerequisites for a given position. That a minority person who is qualifiable would be hired over a person from the Anglo community that is qualified raises all sorts of hackles. But why? The arbitrariness of many of the elements that make a person qualified as opposed to qualifiable is rarely considered by those making the argument.

John H. Bunzel, the President of California State University at San Jose, in the article that accompanied Mr. Pottinger's in the October issue

of Change argues (among other things) that, "The proper goal is to hire the best qualified person, and the paramount criteria should be accomplishment and capacity in teaching and research." Later in the article he argues that Affirmative Action as it is presently is not always well received because, "to an educator the balancing notion is mischievous because it is likely to mean giving up the principle of merit and accomplishment that is central to the integrity of higher education." These statements are examples of the assumption that criteria are well established and easily defensible. It is rather simple to see evidence of research (publications, etc.) but what is the measure for the criterion of accomplishment and capacity in teaching? Also, few people would argue that the principle of merit and accomplishment is central to the integrity of higher education but a good many people will argue about what constitutes merit and accomplishment. Yet these kinds of expressions are used out of hand as if everyone was in agreement with what constitutes good teaching, the relative merit of teaching ability as compared with research or publishing ability, and the limitations or boundaries of the application of the principles of merit and accomplishment. We know that these are continuing issues of contention within higher education. We know also that the criteria with which we have to deal is criteria developed, established, and put into practice with little, if any, input from minorities and women. Perhaps the involvement of these people over a period of time would net no change but that is something that can only be demonstrated after the opportunity for genuine participation is given to the presently excluded groups.

An applicant for a professional level position usually has to go through enough interviews by enough people that it is unlikely someone who is minus the critical requirements for the job function would survive the

screening process. That is, the fears and trepidations about hiring minorities whose qualifications do not exactly fit the assumed essential criteria is unfounded. In the final analysis there are very few people who are concerned with the integrity of higher education who would be a party to the hiring of someone who they knew was not able to do what was required of them.

Regardless of the controversy or of the different viewpoints, the real issue remains. That is, the Chicanos are grossly under-represented in the work force of public higher education. And, Chicanos are even more grossly under-represented in faculty, professional, administrative and executive employee categories.

For example, the total professional representation of Chicanos or Mexican-Americans in the Community Colleges is 3.3%. In the California State University and Colleges system, Chicanos constitute only 1.8% of the total among professional employees. In the UC system, Chicanos are 2.2% of the total among professional employees (see Table V-A, page 68). Clearly not enough is being done.

All of our institutions of public higher education must make a sincere effort to have a realistic and reasonable level of parity in employment. The notion that Chicanos are a lower caste must be eradicated. The only evidence that this has occurred will be reflected in the number and status of employees and not in fancy promises.

Affirmative Action efforts have been made at most campuses. We were impressed by the policy on these matters adopted at Cal Poly at San Luis Obispo.[1] We believe that the administrator recruiting for a position

---

[1]Robert E. Kennedy memorandum to C. Mansel Keene: "Response to FSA"; to All Faculty and Staff: "Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Policy and Program"; and copy of Affirmative Action Program of California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, California (Appendix I).

TABLE V-A

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES BY OCCUPATIONAL GROUP: 1971[1]

	Total Employed	Spanish-Surnamed Number	Spanish-Surnamed Percent
University of California:[2]			
Officials and Managers	2,553	82	3.2
Professionals	39,853	858	2.2
Technicians	10,199	727	7.1
Office & Clerical	25,500	1,688	6.6
Craftsmen (Skilled)	2,891	205	7.0
Operatives (Semi-skilled)	1,109	243	21.9
Laborers	2,419	125	5.2
Service Workers	5,163	462	8.9
Total	89,687	4,390	4.9
California State University and Colleges:[3]		Mexican-American	
Instructional Faculty	12,695	253	1.9
Professional, Administrative and Executive Employees	2,013	37	1.8
Clerical, Trades & Crafts, Technical & Sub-professional, and Protective Services	8,142	314	3.8
Labor, Custodial	2,288	245	19.4
Total	25,138	849	3.4
California Community Colleges:[4]			
Administrative Staff	973	30	3.1
Teaching & Other Certified Staff	25,851	846	3.3
Classified	10,969	878	8.0
Total	37,793	1,754	4.6

[1]Data are presented in this fashion since each system utilizes a distinct method of classification.

[2]Figures are from Employment Information Report--EEO-1, prepared by the Office of the President, April, 1972.

[3]Figures are from Affirmative Action Report provided by the Office of the Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Affairs.

[4]Figures are from the California Community Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, 1972.

should be free to hire a minority person through the normal employment practices. If he hires a non-minority person, however, he should be required to receive approval from the chief administrator responsible for Affirmative Action.

Recommendations

1. The California Coordinating Council for Higher Education should be mandated to conduct a thorough investigation of Affirmative Action Programs in all three systems and on all campuses of public higher education in the State. This study should include a compilation of all of the Affirmative Action Programs and an assessment of the degree of efficacy they have had as well as an enumeration and evaluation of the more difficult problems encountered carrying out the programs.

2. The executive officers of the institutions should be encouraged to publicly support the ideals and objectives of Affirmative Action Programs at their institution while reassuring the people on campus that the integrity of higher education is not threatened by the programs.

3. We recommend that the chief administrators of each of the three systems develop an Affirmative Action policy for their campuses along the following lines. When a new or vacant position at the professional level becomes available, those responsible for hiring should be required to advertise that position through methods guaranteed to receive maximum visibility, and emphasizing the desirability of hiring a Chicano, Black, or American-Indian. If the person responsible for filling that position does so with a member of one of these three ethnic groups, he should be permitted the normal hiring powers. If, however, he hires someone other than a member of these three groups, his action should be reviewed by his administrative superiors on the college campus.

PART VI

CHICANOS AND GRADUATE SCHOOL IN CALIFORNIA: A SUMMARY OF ALL THE EFFORTS

Just as academic success and a positive educational experience in high school is critical to the Chicano student's continuation into college, so the same set of relationships exist between undergraduate and graduate education. Our educational systems had to permit the entrance and success of a significant number of Chicanos in obtaining the baccalaureate degree before the processes of making graduate education appropriate to the Chicano students could even become possible. In a report on the enrollment of Chicanos into the California State University and Colleges system for 1970, we observe that Chicanos formed 5.4% of all undergraduates and 3.0% of all graduate or professional students in that system.[1] Those figures represented 8,249 undergraduate Chicanos and a total of 589 full-time graduate or professional Chicano students. The most significant figure, however, was that which showed that 466 of the 589 were in their first year of full-time graduate work. Clearly there had been some rather instantaneous success in getting Chicano students into the graduate programs of the State University and Colleges system.

Data from the University of California system demonstrated a similar correlation between increases in Chicanos at the undergraduate and at the

---

[1] John M. Smart letter to Durward Long (Appendix G).

graduate level. Between 1968 and 1969, Chicanos as a percentage of undergraduates in the University system went from 1.8% to 3.1% for undergraduates and from 1.1% to 2.4% for graduates. Some improvement was indeed apparent.[1]

But the vicious cycle of under-representation again began to operate in the years between 1969 and 1970.[2] Chicanos as a percentage of total undergraduates in the University system increased only to 3.3% in 1970 from 3.1% in 1969. Relatedly, where their number as a percentage of graduate students in the University system had more than doubled between 1968 and 1969, the increase between 1969 and 1970 was only from 2.4% to 2.8%.

These figures are not at all surprising to the authors. It was to be expected that the graduate schools would only begin to change when they were faced with large numbers of Chicano students demanding and obtaining entrance. This has not really begun to happen. It must be remembered that the 1970 figure of 2.8% Chicanos in the University of California graduate program really represents less than 850 students.

In an effort to obtain more current information on Chicano graduate students, we included a section on graduate education in our mailer questionnaire to chief administrators. The complete questionnaire and tabulation of results are included in the appendix (M). Approximately 50% of all the campuses of the State University and Colleges system and the University of California system responded to our questionnaire. Of those, 73.3% said that they did not have an administrative unit "whose function is to primarily serve Mexican-American or Chicano students." The same percentage indicated

---

[1] McGuire memorandum of March 19, 1971 (Appendix E), see p. 2.

[2] We were unable to obtain comparable longitudinal data for undergraduate and graduate Chicano populations for either the State University and Colleges system or the private colleges.

that their graduate schools did not have "curricular offerings that deal exclusively with the Mexican American or Chicano experience."

The key questions and responses however, as with undergraduate institutions, pertain to the admissions and financial aid policies established for Chicano students. More than 86% of those responding indicated that they did not have "a stated policy with regard to the admission of Mexican-American or Chicano students," and 93% indicated that they did not have a specific sum or proportion of their financial aid resources reserved for these students. It would seem, on the basis of this sketchy data, that admissions procedures and financial aid procedures remain as they always have been in graduate education, highly personalized and traditional.

In 1970 there were 49,788 graduate students in California public higher education.[1] Of that total, only approximately 1,400 were Chicanos. This under-representation at the graduate level has severe consequences since it results in a paucity of educated leaders for the Chicano population. For example, of the 22,356 physicians, dentists, and related professionals employed in Los Angeles County, only 1,309 are Spanish-surnamed/Spanish-speaking, a figure representing less than 5% of the total.[2] Affirmative Action officers frequently told us of the problem of finding "qualified" Chicanos with advanced degrees to work at the college campuses. High school administrators complain that there are not enough Chicano counselors to go around.

---

[1]The figures for the State University and Colleges system were taken from the John M. Smart letter to Durward Long (Appendix G) and include "professional" schools.

[2]Data are obtained from census information in an interview with Los Angeles County Regional Planning Commission.

The relative absence of Chicanos as graduate students in our colleges and universities is the final stage in the vicious cycle of the educational under-representation of Chicanos which is self-reinforcing, and not apt to change without tremendous effort on the part of policymakers. The first stage of the cycle begins in high school, where the Chicano student often suffers the "disadvantages" of speaking mixed Spanish-English, or English with a Spanish accent. It is continued in high school through the influence of peers "going nowhere" who often attempt to keep their friends from going on to college. The pressures of the family, their financial needs, the frequent parental desire to keep Chicanos near the home, and the cost of higher education also are part of this cycle discouraging the Chicano student from going on to college. And then, even if the desire to attend college develops, the Chicano student must often survive the depressing effects of ignorant counselors or college recruiters who just do not have the time to see them all individually.

The cycle enters the next stage when those few Chicano students who do go on to college enter the white world of the average college campus. Computerized and bureaucratic admissions and enrollment are frustrating to any person, particularly one who doubts whether he belongs on a college campus at all. Finally, there is the shortage of financial aid and other student support services, all working to make the collegiate experience a negative one for Chicano students.

It is little wonder that so few Chicano students enter graduate school. And yet, if we are to change the educational systems experienced by the Chicano prior to graduate school, if the Chicano community is to continue to advance educationally, then Chicanos with advanced degrees must be produced in ever greater numbers. The Chicano community needs highly

educated members of La Raza so that its self-advancement can continue to grow. However, if the past repeats itself, the Anglo-dominated institutions will continue to decide how many Chicanos will be educated, and how educated they will be.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The interest in the higher education of the California Chicano which was so evident in the late 1960s is declining, and the figures on reduced enrollment increases presented in the last chapter show the effects of this decline. In place of whatever positive interest and support in the education of Chicanos did exist five years ago, we now discover a major amount of administrative and faculty fatigue and hostility towards "minorities." This fatigue and hostility does not go unperceived. We were amazed at the number of Chicano students answering our questionnaires who named specific faculty or administrators as "unsympathetic racists."

Despite some improvements in the enrollment of Chicano students and the hiring of Chicano faculty and administrators, the current situation is one of gross under-representation of this population on our college campuses. Two conclusions presented in a July, 1972 study, make this point clear.[1]

1. In the Fall of 1971, an estimated 144,000 Mexican Americans were undergraduates in Southwestern colleges. Although this represents a 14 percent increase over the previous fall, the figure would need to be increased by at least another 100,000 to provide a number proportional to the college-age population.
2. Southwestern colleges reported an estimated 1,500 Mexican-American full-time faculty members; this yields a ratio of one Mexican-American faculty member for every 100 Mexican-American students.

The three systems of public higher education are, with few exceptions, not cooperating in a joint effort towards the education of Chicanos. We

---

[1] College Entrance Examination Board Study, pp. 1 ff.

found a surprising lack of information at the offices of the chief administrators of each of the three systems regarding what the other two systems might be doing in Affirmative Action, Chicano student enrollment, and the like. Staff members in charge of Affirmative Action at these central offices, for example, seem too involved in their own administrative problems to consider the possibility of learning from the experiences of the other systems.

Whatever the overall wisdom of the division by the California Master Plan for Higher Education into three systems, we believe it has tended to contribute to isolationism between those systems. The small amount of inter-system cooperation in Chicano programs we did find, for example, an "East Los Angeles College consortium" has occurred at the initiative and administrative level of the individual campuses. Cooperation and even communication between the central offices of the chief administrators of the three systems hardly exists. It is as if each system were trying to perform its own functions and protect its own prerogatives to the exclusion of outside influence. One of the victims of this "cocoon mentality" is the Chicano student.

Nowhere are the consequences of this isolationism as apparent as in the lack of coordination between EOP services for students who transfer from one system to another. As we have already noted, EOP has been the major "special program" resulting in increased numbers of Chicano students on campuses. In fact, the vast majority of all Chicano students at the University of California system are there via the EOP route. We have also discussed the importance of student support services such as counseling and tutoring which are available to students under this program. We were able to summarize our discussion of EOP by noting that students in this program have experienced a

highly respectable degree of academic success. Clearly, then, EOP financial and other support services are important to the collegiate success of many Chicano students.

And yet, we were dismayed to discover that no one is sure what happens to EOP students when they leave, for example, the Community College system, and transfer to a four-year institution. In fact, until very recently no one has been very interested in what happens to them. Knowing what happens to these students is more than an exercise of idle curiosity. Consider the plight of a Chicano student who has enjoyed the benefits of EOP on a Community College campus, with substantial resultant academic success. When he transfers to a four-year institution, as likely as not he will be ignored by the EOP activity on the recipient campus. If he is incorporated into the program, or given the opportunity to be so incorporated, it is the result of the efforts of the EOP staff members on the individual campuses, individuals who are often working under unreasonable demands. We wonder how difficult it would be for the three systems to develop an automated data bank on the academic history, special needs and support of their Chicano students that could be made available to the recipient institutions as these students transfer.

We have in this report developed and discussed a rather long list of problems and conditions that affect the Chicano in California Higher Education. This list includes, among other things, the inadequacy of high school counseling regarding college opportunities, the hostility and bureaucracy of college campuses and their Anglo faculty and students, the familial and economic pressures on the Chicano student, and the relative absence of Chicano faculty and staff. We do, however, believe that two major conditions are pre-eminent barriers to adequate representation of Chicanos in public

higher education. These two conditions are admissions standards and procedures, and adequate financial aid. All of the other problems pale in significance in comparison to these two barriers.

Higher education is not free even at the Community Colleges. One study estimates that it costs a commuting student at least between $1,300.00 and $1,500.00 a year to go to the typical Community College.[1] We believe this is low for California. It is clear that financial aid and admissions are directly related. Even in the open admissions situation at the Community College, access is clearly dependent on the ability to pay the cost of going to college. We have noted that the EOP efforts have been the major source of financial aid to Chicano students, with other financial aid activities, particularly in the form of various state scholarships, having some significance. We believe that the financial aid resources of EOP must be dramatically increased. If government is not willing to do this, then they have effectively closed the door to major increases of Chicano students on college campuses.

Admissions is a more complex problem, partly because it is a problem area which elicits a good deal of emotion from those defending the status quo. Because we believe that existing admissions criteria are so irrelevant to measuring the academic potential of Chicano students, we theoretically favor completely open admissions for Chicano students in all three systems. We do, however, suspect that this solution may not be acceptable to those in power. Therefore, we recommend the following program regarding the admission of Chicanos into public higher education in this State.

First, the traditional admission standards of high school achievement, aptitude tests, and the like, which are described in the Master Plan

---

[1]College Entrance Examination Board Study, pp. 11 ff.

and in the numerous admissions rules and regulations on the campuses should be completely eliminated with regard to Chicanos. In their place, the Coordinating Council should develop standards and procedures for measuring creativity, intellectual potential, and motivation in Chicanos with the objective of predicting the possible success in college. These standards should be developed through further analysis of the significant characteristics of the successful EOP Chicano students, through conversations and interviews with EOP Chicano staff, and with capable Chicano high school counselors and teachers. These individuals have the greatest amount of experience and knowledge, intuitive though it may be, with the procedures of recognizing collegiate potential among Chicanos. Once developed, these standards might be tested against the academic experiences of sample groups of Chicanos in college. Once validated, these standards should be universally applied to Chicanos who apply at each and every campus of public higher education in the State.

The application of new and culturally relevant standards for measuring academic potential among Chicanos will not have the needed consequences as long as the four-year college systems continue to restrict their definition of eligible as to a certain "top" percentage of high school students. As we, and other educators, have repeatedly argued, there is often little relationship between high school and college success for the Chicano. Therefore we favor the following policy. Any Chicano student who applies to any institution of any of the three public systems, and who meets the new standards for gauging academic potential which we describe above as being developed by the Coordinating Council, shall be admitted to that institution.

As a general conclusion, and in specific reference to this last rather "radical" recommendation, we must make reference again to the complete inadequacy of information on Chicano students, faculty, staff, and programs. In this report, we have repeatedly called for the collection of new information and research. We have done it again with reference to the all-important matter of the admission of Chicanos to college. It goes without saying that the proposed study of new admissions criteria, as well as all the other research and data collection must be conducted with the maximum possible involvement of knowledgeable and experienced Chicanos. In this regard, it is most fitting to conclude this report by again referring to the complete inadequacy of the Master Plan with regard to Chicanos and higher education. The Master Plan has made the Coordinating Council responsible for data collection and research. The Master Plan also ignores the education of Chicanos. Data collection and research on Chicanos in the State's higher education systems, an important prelude to adequate programmatic planning in important areas such as admissions standards, has also been virtually ignored. This blindness regarding the educational potential and needs of Chicanos cannot and must not be continued.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AVAILABLE LITERATURE ON CHICANOS AND HIGHER EDUCATION

A policy study of this type often benefits from a survey of literature analyzing and describing the various relevant policy areas. There is no significant body of literature concerned with Chicanos and higher education. Almost all of the publications that do exist pertain to the Chicano and his pre-college education. Thus, a literature survey was of no help in this particular study or in understanding this particular subject.

The reasons for this absence of literary analysis are multiple, but all relate to a simple reality. Until recently there have been few Chicanos who enjoyed the benefits of higher education. Thus, there were no Chicanos in higher education to study as a basis for any scholarly work. We hope that the increased numbers of Chicanos on our college and university campuses may lead to the development of literature concerning their education.

The United States Office of Education has collected some information on Chicanos and college, but no significant publications have resulted from that data. A publication was issued in 1970 on the subject of The Minority Student on Campus, but it does not concentrate on the problems of Chicanos, and is short on data. (See Item No. 2 on following bibliography.)

It is sad but significant that we have to state that our current study for the Joint Committee is probably as comprehensive and complete as any publication on this subject. Our bibliography also includes a list of other literature that we have found useful in understanding Chicanos and higher education in California. We have undoubtedly ignored one or two articles or doctoral dissertations on the subject, and for this we apologize. We did,

however, confirm our belief that there is little or no literature available on the subject by asking five college professors in education and Chicano Studies the following question: "What major publications, articles, or books are available on the Chicano and higher education?" The responses were almost identical from all five. "There is virtually nothing around, and certainly little of real value."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, Peter D. EOP in the California Community Colleges, 1970: Perspectives on Programs, Evaluation of a Training Program. A report prepared for the Rio Hondo College. Berkeley: KARDI Corporation, 1970.

Altman, Robert A. and Snyder, Patricia O., Eds. The Minority Student on the Campus: Expectations and Possibilities. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley; and Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, Colorado, November 1970.

Burma, John H. Mexican-Americans in the United States: a Reader. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1970.

Carter, Thomas P. Mexican-Americans in School: a History of Educational Neglect. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Casavantes, Edward J. A New Look at the Attributes of the Mexican American. Albuquerque, New Mexico: Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory, Inc., March 1969.

Ferrin, Richard I.; Jonsen, Richard W.; Trimble, Cesar M. Access to College for Mexican Americans in the Southwest. Higher Education Surveys Report No. 6. Princeton, N. J.: College Entrance Examination Board, July 1972.

Gordon, Edward W. and Wilkerson, Doxey A. Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged: Programs and Practices, Preschool Through College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Grebler, Leo; Moore, Joan W.; and Guzman, Ralph C. Mexican-American People: the Nation's Second Largest Minority. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Jakobovits, Leon A. and Miron, Murray S., Eds. Readings in the Psychology of Language. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1967.

Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. The Academic Revolution. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968.

Johnson, Henry S. and Hernandez-M, William J. Educating the Mexican-American. Valley Forge, Pa.: Judson Press, 1970.

Kitano, Harry H. L. and Miller, Dorothy L. "An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education." A report prepared for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Council Report 70-1. San Francisco, Cal.: Scientific Analysis Corporation, 1970.

Knowlton, Dr. Clark S. "Spanish-Speaking People of the Southwest." A report prepared for the Department of Sociology, University of Texas at El Paso, March 31, 1967.

McPherran, Archie L. "Salary Schedules for Administrative Personnel in California Community Colleges 1971-72." A report prepared under the direction of Assistant Chancellor, Division of Fiscal Affairs, California Community Colleges, January 1972.

Mittlebach, Frank G. and Marshall, Grace. "The Burden of Poverty," Advance Report 5 of the Mexican-American Study Project, Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, University of California, Los Angeles, California, July 1966.

Moore, Joan W. with Cuellar, Alfredo. Mexican Americans: Ethnic Groups in American Life Series. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Newman, Frank (Chairman), et al. Report on Higher Education. A report prepared for the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, March 1971.

ADDITIONAL READER REFERENCES

Admissions Study Digest, A Summary of the California State Colleges, 1963 Admissions Study--Phase I. A report prepared for the Division of Institutional Research, The California State Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, April 1969.

ACR 78: Recognizing the Contributions of Ethnic Minorities (mimeographed). Agenda Item D prepared under staff direction of Russell L. Riese, Chief Higher Education Specialist, October 3, 1972.

A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-75. Prepared for the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

Educational Opportunity Programs 1970-71. A report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the California State University and Colleges, Office of the Chancellor, Division of Student Affairs, July 1972.

Five Years Later: A Follow-up to the California State Colleges 1963 Admissions Study-Phase II (Monograph Number Three, April 1970). Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, The California State Colleges.

Intercultural Studies in the Public Community Colleges of California, a report to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, prepared by Pacific Training and Technical Assistance Corporation, Berkeley, California, 1971.

California Higher Education and the Disadvantaged: A Status Report. Revised for Presentation to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education February 19, 1968.

Californians of Spanish Surname: Population; Employment; Income; Education. A report prepared by the Human Relations Agency, Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Fair Employment Practices. San Francisco: May, 1964 (mimeographed).

Less Time, More Options: Education Beyond the High School. A Special report and recommendations by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, January 1971. Hightstown, New Jersey: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1971.

Office of Undergraduate Recruitment and Development (Brochure). University of California, Los Angeles, 1972-73. General information regarding special programs for the recruitment and selection of disadvantaged persons at UCLA.

Summary Profile: Fall 1969 Upper Division Transfer Students with Intra-System Observations. Technical Memorandum Number Five, August 1971 Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, The California State Colleges.

Those Who Made It: Selected Characteristics of the June 1967 California State College Baccalaureate Graduates, Monograph Number One, January, 1969. Division of Institutional Research, Office of the Chancellor, The California State Colleges.

MISCELLANEOUS EXTRACTS

Harvey, James. "Minorities and Advanced Degrees"(Xeroxed Extract from Research Currents, ERIC Higher Education, June 1, 1972.

Weidlein, Edward R. "1,276 Minority-Group Students Enter Medical Study, Twice the '69 Total," Xeroxed Extract from The Chronicle of Higher Education, undated.

Nosotros, May 1972, El Paso, Texas. Vol.2, No. 2.

Quarterly Bulletin, No. 116, April 1, 1972, Regional Planning Commission, County of Los Angeles, California.

APPENDIX A

ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Morgan Odell

A Statement to the Joint Committee on the
Master Plan for Higher Education
May 3, 1972

APPENDIX A-1

ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Statement to the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education

presented by

MORGAN ODELL

for

THE ASSOCIATION OF INDEPENDENT CALIFORNIA COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

May 3, 1972

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Joint Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views on Access to Higher Education.

I. Whom should postsecondary education be for?

Universal equality of access --

Given the comprehensive postsecondary education resources available to Californians, we should indicate to our young people and their parents that we believe that students should have the opportunity to pursue education as far as they wish, according to their own ability, motivation and educational needs. At the same time we also should indicate that in some fields of study, mostly at the graduate and professional level (medicine, currently), there may not be enough spaces for all qualified and interested students because resources for high cost programs are likely to be limited. Universal equality of access does not mean that all students should have equal access to the University of California, the State University and Colleges, the community colleges, or to every independent institution. It should be our objective to provide sufficient access so that each individual student will have an opportunity to attend the type of institution that best matches his qualifications and educational goals and needs; lack of financial resources should not be a determining factor in deciding access.

The independent institutions of the State provide a considerable range of variety in admissions requirements, educational programs and style of campus life, as do the institutions in the public sector. Student counseling

and student decisions in selecting a college should give consideration to the variety of choices available to each individual. Our objective should be to enable each student to enroll in the type of institution best suited to him, according to his own motivation. If we find a shortage of spaces in any particular type of institution than the State and the appropriate segments should take steps to increase available spaces.

Equality of access does not mean that every institution, whether public or private, should have the same admissions requirements or should do the same things for all students. Each segment of the public sector should establish its admissions requirements in terms of the nature of its academic programs and its educational objectives; each independent institution is and must remain free to do the same. It would seem, for example, that the high admissions requirements of the University of California are essential if it is to perform its appropriate educational functions. The independent institutions strongly support differentiation of admissions requirements in the public sector just as they support differentiation of educational functions.

Who are the people who do not have access? We do not believe that anyone now has a satisfactory answer to this question. We urge that an effort be made to deal with this subject before the Joint Committee completes its study.

II. Adequate facilities

It appears that existing physical facilities may be adequate or close to it but without more information we can not be as certain that the educational programs offered are or will be adequate to meet student needs and desires. In other words, if student choice were not limited by what is available or by student financial ability, we might now have a rather different pattern of educational programs across the State.

III. Adequate mechanisms for information

The means of disseminating information about higher education in California can no doubt be improved. Our basic procedures seem adequate but there appears to be universal agreement that high school counselors should have more time and knowledge to do an effective job in advising students.

IV. Concern of state policy with providing access to all forms of post-secondary education and to Independent Higher Education

The answer to both parts of this question is clearly "Yes."

V. When should education be made available?

We should develop as much flexibility as possible in both public and private institutions. It seems reasonably clear that both individual preferences and societal demands are changing, but it is much less clear whether they are changing to some new stable arrangement or whether we are in for considerable flux for some years to come. We think this is no time to lock higher education into a definitive pattern, and, therefore, we believe that the answers to questions A, B, C, and D under this heading should go in the direction of greater flexibility for both institutions and individuals.

VI. Business and Labor assistance to their employees

Yes.

VII. Relationship between access and quality education

The answer to this question depends somewhat on the definition of "quality." Traditionally we have tended to equate "quality" with higher levels of academic achievement, higher degrees, more rigorous admission and graduation standards, etc. But quality only can exist when there is a good match of student and institution. We need to recognize that a distinguished liberal arts college may not mean "quality" for a student whose aspirations, talents and interests suggest technical training. A community college emphasizing such programs would represent higher quality for that student. If quality is thought of in these terms there is no conflict between access and quality education. There is no way nor should there be a way in which every Californian can have equality of access to a particular institution in this State. At the same time every educational program in every institution should develop and maintain its own quality. In that sense there is equality of quality.

VIII. How can policies reflect decision to provide limited or universal access?

We are talking about universal access to the particular segment, or type of individual college for which a student is best suited. We must try to make provisions that will assure that no student is forced to choose his college or university or choose no college at all on financial grounds. Ideally,

we should have a student aid program of sufficient scope and flexibility so that each student will have equality of access to the kind of institution best for him.

IX. Public segment admissions standards

We believe it would be feasible and perhaps desirable for individual public institutions to have greater flexibility in admissions standards.

X. Post-secondary mix

The post-secondary system as a whole should reflect closely the various characteristics of the citizens of the State.

Thank you again for the chance to meet with your committee.

APPENDIX B

SOURCES OF PRIMARY INFORMATION FOR THIS REPORT

HIGH SCHOOLS ASKED TO MAIL STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES:

Located in the following Areas:

1. Azusa
2. Bakersfield
3. Chino
4. Lincoln Heights
5. Oxnard
6. San Jose

High schools were selected which had a large number of Chicano students. We also selected them so as to get campuses from various parts of the State, and from communities with varying degrees of urban and rural characteristics.

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES ASKED TO MAIL STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES:

1. University System:
   1. Berkeley
   2. Santa Barbara
2. State University and Colleges System:
   1. Fresno
   2. Long Beach
3. Community Colleges:
   1. East Los Angeles
   2. Sacramento
   3. Ventura

Colleges and universities were selected so as to get institutions from all three systems of public higher education and campuses from various sections of the State.

METHODOLOGICAL COMMENTS:

We were unable to discover any central lists of Spanish-surnamed high school or college students. The resources available for this study make it impossible to compile such lists by contacting each and every public high school, college and university in the State. Selecting institutions in the manner described above seemed the second best alternative. Since students receiving the mailer were in no way a representative sample of the total universe of Spanish-surnamed students, we do not, of course, claim any quantifiable level of precision for the results. The results of these questionnaires are suggestive, illustrative, and often very creative. They are not, however, scientifically generalizable to the State's population of Spanish-surnamed students at these grade levels.

SITE VISITATIONS:

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES:
1. Berkeley
2. East Los Angeles
3. Fresno
4. Long Beach
5. Sacramento
6. San Diego
7. Santa Barbara
8. Ventura

HIGH SCHOOLS:
1. Azusa
2. Chino
3. Pomona
4. West Sacramento

Our selection of these campuses for site visitations was based on approximately the same considerations as those used in the selection of campuses for the mailer to students. We wanted to guarantee that we made use of campuses from various sections of the State, that each of the campuses had a significant number of Chicano students, and that all three systems of public higher education were represented.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:

Interviews and conversations with personnel from the California State Department of Education occurred during the entire duration of this study and included Department personnel from their sections on Counseling, Vocational Education, Legislative Liaison, and Bilingual-Bicultural Programs.

INTERVIEWS WITH TOP ADMINISTRATORS IN THREE SYSTEMS OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION:

These interviews were non-structured and in-depth interviews. They included vice presidents, vice chancellors, EOP coordinators, research and data specialists, affirmative action officials, admissions officials, and others concerned with minority students and special programs.

In addition to what has already been mentioned (See page 34) about the purposes and consequences of these visits, it is important to further qualify their nature and the extent of the benefit the visits provided toward a better understanding of Chicanos in public higher education. First, it must be clear that the authors do not consider these visits a statistical sample. Second, and equally as important, the various campuses that were

visited followed a letter from the chairman of the joint sub-committee. A liaison was appointed by the chancellor or president of the college or university to assist us in our activity. In each instance the individual involved was very cooperative and fair (in the sense that there was no deliberate "stacking" of the meetings). However, such an approach does in no way lend itself to objectivity. Following in this vein it must also be recalled that in nearly every instance the "structured" portion of the discussions was restricted to groups although a number of people were spoken to individually. In each case people were led to believe that a degree of confidence was involved in the discussion. While it appears to be true that the overwhelming majority of people spoken to were not concerned about the anonymity of their statements, it is also true that it is our belief that they would not have been quite so frank had we suggested that their statements were for the record.

The single most dramatic aspect to the visits and the one thing that stood as the most often repeated was the propensity of the people on campus to try to get information about Chicanos and about local difficulties from the interviewer. For example, in one instance, the students spoken to initially manifested a degree of belligerence which became or transformed into hope that we (as representatives of the State) might be able to help them cope with their situation which they perceived as being one in which they were able to receive little or no response from the administration.[1]

---

[1]This incident which occurred at UC San Diego might be of interest to the reader. The attitude of the several students spoken to was one of profound pessimism. Their initial response was one of grim distrust. They felt no one had listened to them and the people with whom they had dealt, had dealt with them with duplicity. After a period of discussion, they began to openly express their views that the university had reneged on its commitment or promise that the governance of the school involved their participation. They were disillusioned and bitter people who asserted

In sharp contrast with this, some of the administrators felt that they had a precise perspective on what the Chicano students "needed." Their apparent ignorance of the profundity of the dejection among the students was disheartening. This is not to suggest that people were not aware of many of the problems but rather to represent their view that most of the student's problems could be solved if the students would concentrate on their studies, and worry less about the operation of the institution.

The students in this instance expressed a sense of desperation and the people who were working in the institution expressed frustration. If funds were available, the students' needs could be met, suggested the administrators, but the student perspective was that what was needed was more honesty and integrity in relation to the students.

On another campus, the most impressive feeling was that people in the discussion group felt subdued and somewhat reluctant about participating. One person abruptly said that what was needed was MONEY in a very loud and dramatic voice. After some verbal meandering people began to perk up and began to talk enthusiastically about problems and potential solutions. The conversation became lively in spite of the many questions directed toward the interviewer. After the meeting broke up, several of the participants stopped to express their gratitude about the opportunity to discuss the

---

that they were being treated with contempt and disdain. They also felt that their experience was a classical example of the extremes that the institution was willing to go to minimize the relevance of the institution to Chicanos. At the time of the meeting they were in the process of considering a mass walk-out or withdrawal of all of the Chicano students. If such a move was agreed upon, they asserted, they would have the support of nearly all of the Chicano students on campus. The question at hand was whether or not such a move was in the best interests of all of the Chicano students involved and not whether or not they would have support from Chicano students for such a move.

problems. They asserted that on their campus (Fresno State) such discussions were not encouraged. They expressed the feeling that too often Chicanos or minorities were treated as outcasts and as not being an appropriate topic for discussion. It was something of a strange experience to be seen as a person who was helping people rather than one who was simply investigating what was happening.

U.C. Berkeley and Sacramento City College were notable exceptions in terms of the tone of the visitations. On both of these campuses the people spoken to were primarily Chicanos and the topics for discussion focused on what the institutions still needed to do (e.g., more recruitment, counseling, financial aid, etc.). The feeling that they strongly expressed was that while there has been progress and while some real effort has been made to accommodate Chicanos by some people, there still remains a good deal to be done and there is too much foot-dragging on some issues. What most needs to be done (besides some more effort in areas already mentioned), according to most of the Chicanos spoken to on all the campuses), is a more sincere effort to recruit and maintain Chicano graduate students and a more sincere effort to hire Chicanos at the professional level. In no instance did people infer that any of these activities approximated a panacea but they did express the view that until there was more aggressive activity in these areas there would still be cause to believe the institutions were in the business of excluding Chicanos from equal opportunity.

Certainly the most consistent and the most disappointing thing about the visits was the manifest ignorance about Chicanos. It was even more disappointing in view of the apparent fact that most of the people sincerely wanted to have more information so they could deal more effectively with Chicano students. There really was only one person who expressed a degree

of hostility with the indirect assertion (via questions) that all of the difficulties faced by Chicanos was a consequence of their (Chicano's) own doing. What is evident is that on many campuses there is precious little communication between Chicanos and the rest of the campus community. That so many of the "interviews" were turned into lectures may also indicate that a third party is necessary to lay the foundation for effective communications.

APPENDIX C

COUNCIL REPORT 71-5

April 1971

COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

(This report in its entirety is available at source,
and is known as
"Educational Opportunity Programs in California Public Higher Education:
1969-70"
through the Coordinating Council for Higher Education,
Sacramento, California.)

SOME GENERAL COMMENTS ON COUNCIL REPORT 71-5, COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION REPORT ON EOP, APRIL 1971

Of the many documents, reports, books and articles that we have perused for our report, Educational Opportunity Programs 1969-70 is one of the most, if not the most, significant. We strongly recommend that this Council Report 71-5 be read in its entirety. It includes summaries of a number of reports on EOP and some very perceptive analyses and recommendations. In this Appendix C we will review or reiterate some of the parts of the report that appeared as being of particular significance to us.

The second paragraph of the Introduction is suggestive of some of the problems that EOP has faced. There have been too many "studies" of EOP by too many people; so much so that valuable time, energy, and resources are exhausted to satisfy the many requests for data. We concur with this view and feel that efficiency demands that a reporting procedure be established by the CCHE. This reporting procedure must be such that there results a sufficient amount of relevant data for annual reports and sufficient data to satisfy the needs of other researchers. Given one reporting procedure the EOP personnel can allocate their time and resources in a way that optimizes the cost-benefit ratio for this activity.

Clearly EOP has and will likely continue to undergo considerably closer monitoring than "regular" campus programs or activities. Without entering into the whys and wherefores of this we can conclude, as was done in the CCHE Report (p. I-1), that this constant series of investigations only serves to:

> . . . create or emphasize the "differentness" of EOP students, and to develop fears on the part of many that their programs--and their very existence as college students--are at best grudgingly supported by the government and the educational establishment, and that excuses are constantly being sought to summarily eliminate EOP.

The concluding paragraph of the introduction also makes a point that should be kept in mind by all of those individuals who are persistently suspicious of the programs:

> It should be emphasized, however, that based on the many reports of investigations that have so far been conducted by State agencies and others, and on council staff observations during the course of this study, it appears that EOP should be strongly supported--on the basis of current segmental requests --as a statewide program which has provided economically and educationally disadvantaged people in every sector of the State the solid hope that, at last, they may look forward to freeing themselves of the odious poverty-welfare chain that has encircled the ghettos, barrios, and reservations of minorities and disadvantaged for far too long.

This Council Report 71-5 makes a clear case for the positive role that EOP plays within California's systems of public higher education both by its own observations and in the review of other studies. If public higher education in California is to serve the entire community of the State it must begin to give vigorous support to EOP and curtail the constant peering over the shoulder of the programs.

APPENDIX D

XAVIER DEL BUONO, ASSOCIATE SUPERINTENDENT
AND DIRECTOR OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

to

JIM NELSON
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

State of California, Department of Education

August 30, 1972

Subject: Questionnaire Sponsored by the

Joint Committee on the

Master Plan for Higher Education

State of California

Memorandum

Department of Education

RECEIVED
AUG 1 1972
Bureau of Field Management
Compensatory Education

To Jim Nelson
Compensatory Education

Date : August 30, 1972

File No.:

From : Xavier Del Buono, Associate Superintendent
and Director of Compensatory Education

Subject: Questionnaire Sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education

As per your request to Ples Griffin, Chief, Bureau of Intergroup Relations, for responses to the questionnaire dated July 20, 1972, from the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education, I am submitting the following information.

Question 1: In what ways do the State's public high schools influence the Chicano students' ability to attend colleges?

Answer 1: In positive ways if they do, and in negative ways if they don't provide the following:

A. Educational institution that is aware of the culture, history and current problems of the children they teach;

B. Teachers that are capable of stimulating children;

APPENDIX D-1

C. Role models from his racial group as

(1) Teachers
(2) Administrators
(3) Certificated personnel who are not teachers or administrators
(4) Guests on Career Education Day

D. Materials that relate to his personal experiences;

E. Materials that give him a sense of pride in his identity;

F. Environment such as naming schools after such heroes as Emiliono Zapata, Cesar Chavez, Elfego Baca, Ruben Salazar;

G. Bilingual education;

H. Counselors that believe they should be proportionally represented in the colleges;

I. Financial programs that encourage them to go to college.

Question 2: What is the total number of students who graduated from our public high schools?

a. Spring 1972
b. Spring 1971
c. Spring 1970

Answer 2: We do not know the number that graduated but the number that were counted in the racial and ethnic survey of October 1970 and 1971, as twelfth graders, are:

October 1971 - 294,818
October 1970 - 282,257
October 1969 - no statistics available

Question 3: What was the ethnic composition of the graduating students for each of these three periods?

a. Spring 1972
b. Spring 1971
c. Spring 1970

Answer 3: We do not know whether they graduated or not but the composition of the twelfth grade in the racial and ethnic surveys of October 1970 and 1971 are:

	American Indian	Black	Asian	Brown	Other Nonwhite	Other White
1971	.4	7.3	2.5	12.1	.9	73.4
1970	.3	7.0	2.4	11.4	.6	78.2
1969	No percentages available					

Question 4: What percentage of Chicano students graduating from our public high schools go on to college? How does that compare to other ethnic groups?

Answer 4: The only reliable statistics available are those on the community colleges for the year 1971. The percentages given are those of the K-12 enrollment and the community college enrollment by racial and ethnic group. In order to arrive at a rough measure as to how likely it is for a person from one racial group to get into a community college in comparison with other ethnic groups, we have divided the K-12 percentage into the community college percentage.

	American Indian	Oriental	Other White	Black	Brown
Percentage of Community College to K-12 Enrollment	4.00	1.63	1.09	.80	.51
Community College Enrollment Percent	1.2	3.6	79.5	7.6	8.1
K-12 Percent	0.3	2.2	72.4	9.5	15.6

Question 5: Why don't more Chicano students attend college?

Answer 5: In addition to the answers supplied in number one, we find:

A. Lack of Chicano colleges which would bring in the marginal Chicano student;

B. Lack of reinforcement of belief in his potentialities due to lack of models in the media;

C. Due to the lack of social, psychological and economic resources.

Question 6: Of those Chicano students graduating from our public high schools, who do attend college, how many attend community colleges, state colleges, and universities, the university system, and private colleges, what percentage of the total attending college do so in this state?

Answer 6: The only reliable statistics at this time on Chicano attendance at college are those quoted in number 4 above.

Question 7: What do you believe are some of the major reasons that Chicano students attend the colleges they do (e.g., community colleges, university system, etc.)?

Answer 7: Economic criteria such as distance and tuition.

Question 8: How many credentialed counselors are employed in the state's public high schools?

Answer 8: No information on this question.

Question 9: How many of these counselors are Spanish surnames or Chicanos?

Answer 9: Although we have no statistics on how many counselors are Spanish surnames, we do know that the ratio of certificated people who are not teachers, non-teaching principals or non-teaching assistant principals, to the ratio of students from their ethnic groups are:

Other White	Black	Asian	American Indian	Other Nonwhite	Brown
1/302	1/431	1/499	1/643	1/1242	1/1593

Question 10: Does the department of education or the school districts engage in active recruitment of Chicano counselors? If so, what are some of the common practices used in recruiting, and how effective are they? What other practices might be used?

Answer 10: Other practices that might be used are:

A. Contacting Mexican American education groups such as:

1. Association of Mexican American Educators
2. Chicano Psychologists Association
3. Chicano Task Force

B. Visiting the colleges and talking to Chicano student groups.

Question 11: What are the major techniques used by counselors in recognizing college potential in Chicano students? What other methods might be used?

Answer 11: No information on this question.

Question 12: How is the effectiveness of counselors evaluated?

Answer 12: No information on this question.

Question 13: How do high school counselors obtain information on college opportunities for their Chicano students? What other methods might be used?

Answer 13: No information on this question.

Question 14: Are there any particularly effective programs conducted by the Department of Education or particular school districts aimed at improving educational counseling for Chicano students? Describe and evaluate these.

Answer 14: In one district, we know the district in order to make up for the lack of Chicano counselors has hired parents from the community as counselor aides.

From what I have been told this is very successful when compared with the alternative of no Chicano counselors.

Question 15: Does the department of education work with the central administration of any of the major sectors of public higher education in the state in an effort to increase the number of Chicano high school graduates attending college? If so, describe and evaluate these efforts. How might the department and public higher education work together to increase the number of Chicanos attending colleges?

Answer 15: The department and public higher education might work together to increase the number of Chicanos attending colleges by encouraging school districts to work with public higher education to arrange for visits to the college campus by elementary, junior high and senior high school Chicanos. They are escorted by Chicano student club groups, such as MECHA, and visit in the dorms with Chicanos. It might foster the development of College Folklorico and Teatro Campesino groups that could entertain on the high school campuses. It could use members of the college Chicano student groups to visit the high school campus to speak to assemblies to encourage Chicanos to raise their educational sights.

Question 16: Does the department have stated policies regarding the counseling of Mexican American students? Please describe these policies. Are these policies formal or informal?

Answer 16: No information available on this question.

We hope that the information supplied will suffice. Thanks for calling on us for this assistance.

APPENDIX E

JOSEPH W. McGUIRE
Office of the President: Vice President--Planning

to

PRESIDENT HITCH, VICE PRESIDENTS, CHANCELLORS

March 19, 1971

SCHEDULES OF THE FALL 1970 ETHNIC SURVEY

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
VICE PRESIDENT—PLANNING

APPENDIX E-1

March 19, 1971

PRESIDENT HITCH
VICE PRESIDENTS
CHANCELLORS:

The attached schedules summarize the results of the Fall 1970 Ethnic Survey and provide comparative data for previous years. You will recall that the procedure for obtaining the data is for students to complete a voluntary survey card included in the registration packet. The data included in the attached summaries conform to the definitions required by the Civil Rights Compliance Report and, thus, in some instances may not completely coincide with individual campus reports.

The interpretation and evaluation of the data will undoubtedly vary depending on the point of view of the reader. In general, however, it can be noted that the University continues to make progress in improving the ethnic balance of its student population.

Three campuses (Davis, Riverside and Santa Cruz) have slight declines in 1970 minority percentages, but only Davis experienced a numerical loss. In the total University, all minority groups, particularly Black students, were better represented this year. It should also be noted, however, that as the fiscal crisis intensifies the prospects for continued growth in 1971 may not be very good.

Joseph W. McGuire

Attachments

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT--PLANNING

Summary of Fall 1968 - Fall 1970 Ethnic Surveys

Campus	Enrollment Surveyed*			Percentage Negro			Percentage American Indian			Percentage Oriental			Percentage Mexican or Spanish-American		
	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
Berkeley															
Undergraduate	16,844	18,116	18,822	2.8	3.2	4.5	0.2	0.3	0.5	9.8	12.2	12.6	1.3	2.5	2.3
Graduate	9,101	9,972	9,703	1.9	2.5	4.5	0.1	0.1	0.1	2.3	4.0	3.3	1.0	1.8	1.9
Total	25,985	28,088	28,525	2.5	2.9	4.5	0.2	0.2	0.4	7.2	9.3	9.4	1.2	2.2	2.2
Davis															
Undergraduate	8,697	9,263	9,979	0.9	1.9	1.9	0.4	0.4	0.6	3.7	5.8	5.3	1.0	2.2	1.7
Graduate	2,696	2,964	3,191	0.7	1.4	1.4	0.2	0.3	0.5	1.7	3.2	3.5	0.7	2.7	1.1
Total	11,393	12,227	13,170	0.9	1.8	1.7	0.3	0.4	0.6	3.2	5.2	4.9	0.9	2.3	1.6
Irvine															
Undergraduate	2,989	3,334	5,054	0.6	1.7	2.5	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.9	3.4	3.5	0.9	2.5	2.6
Graduate	910	933	1,008	0.3	1.0	1.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	1.3	1.8	2.6	0.8	1.8	1.4
Total	3,899	4,267	6,062	0.6	1.5	2.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.8	3.0	3.3	0.9	2.4	2.4
Los Angeles**															
Undergraduate	18,722	19,542	18,009	3.4	4.2	5.0	0.3	0.7	0.7	7.0	9.4	9.6	3.2	4.6	4.8
Graduate	9,717	10,338	10,115	2.7	4.4	5.4	0.3	0.5	0.5	3.2	4.5	4.8	1.5	3.0	4.0
Total	28,439	29,880	28,124	3.2	4.3	5.1	0.3	0.6	0.6	5.7	6.8	7.8	2.6	2.0	4.5
Riverside															
Undergraduate	3,419	3,893	4,673	1.9	3.0	4.2	0.4	0.4	0.5	1.3	2.1	2.6	2.2	4.2	4.2
Graduate	1,155	1,293	1,318	0.9	2.7	1.5	0.1	0.2	0.4	1.4	4.4	2.5	1.3	4.3	3.8
Total	4,574	5,186	5,991	1.6	2.9	3.6	0.3	0.3	0.5	1.3	2.7	2.6	1.9	4.2	4.1

* Approximately 85% of registered students responded to the questionnaire. At all campuses in 1968 and 1970 and at Berkeley and Los Angeles in 1969 percentages from the survey have been applied to total enrollment. Health Science Interns and Residents are excluded.

** 1969 figures for Los Angeles allocate resident aliens to ethnic groups.

Campus	Enrollment* Surveyed			Percentage Negro			Percentage American Indian			Percentage Oriental			Percentage Mexican or Spanish-American		
	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
San Diego															
Undergraduate	2,665	2,939	4,310	1.0	1.9	4.0	0.3	0.3	0.5	1.7	3.1	3.7	1.3	2.9	4.5
Graduate	1,089	1,008	1,339	0.6	1.2	2.0	0.3	0.2	0.1	1.5	2.2	3.1	0.8	2.0	2.8
Total	3,754	3,947	5,649	0.9	1.7	3.5	0.3	0.3	0.4	1.6	2.9	3.5	1.2	2.6	4.1
San Francisco***															
Undergraduate	361	349	379	0.6	4.0	5.4	0.3	0.3	0.0	7.2	8.9	11.6	0.8	2.0	1.3
Graduate	1,536	1,487	1,606	2.3	4.6	5.9	0.3	0.2	0.3	9.4	13.2	13.5	0.5	2.4	3.7
Total	1,897	1,836	1,985	2.0	4.5	5.8	0.3	0.2	0.3	9.0	12.4	13.1	0.6	2.3	2.9
Santa Barbara															
Undergraduate	10,581	9,579	11,798	1.2	1.7	2.4	0.2	0.3	0.6	2.5	2.9	3.3	1.2	2.3	3.2
Graduate	1,738	1,662	1,846	0.6	1.7	1.9	0.2	0.4	0.8	1.6	1.1	1.5	0.8	1.4	3.3
Total	12,319	11,241	13,644	1.1	1.7	2.3	0.2	0.3	0.6	2.3	2.6	3.0	1.1	2.2	3.2
Santa Cruz															
Undergraduate	2,539	2,843	3,495	1.1	2.0	1.9	0.2	0.2	0.4	2.6	3.8	4.3	1.2	3.4	3.2
Graduate	99	148	277	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.4
Total	2,638	2,991	3,772	1.1	1.9	1.8	0.2	0.2	0.4	2.5	3.7	4.1	1.1	3.3	3.1
11 Campuses															
Undergraduate	66,857	69,858	76,519	2.2	2.9	3.6	0.3	0.4	0.6	5.7	7.5	7.4	1.8	3.1	3.3
Graduate	28,041	29,805	30,403	1.9	3.0	4.0	0.2	0.3	0.4	2.8	4.3	4.2	1.1	2.4	2.8
Total	94,898	99,663	106,922	2.1	2.[illegible]	3.7	0.2	0.4	0.5	4.8	6.4	6.5	1.6	2.9	3.1

***San Francisco data for 1969 were derived from a separate survey and are not comparable with 1968 and 1970 figures.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT--PLANNING

Summary of Fall 1968 - Fall 1970 Ethnic Surveys*

Campus	Negro			American Indian			Oriental			Mexican or Spanish-American		
	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
Berkeley												
Undergraduate	474	580	840	31	47	93	1,660	2,203	2,366	226	446	439
Graduate	170	244	433	11	12	14	210	396	325	87	175	186
Total	644	824	1,273	42	59	107	1,870	2,599	2,691	313	621	625
Davis												
Undergraduate	82	178	185	32	37	60	322	535	531	84	202	171
Graduate	18	42	44	6	8	17	45	96	112	18	81	34
Total	100	220	229	38	45	77	367	631	643	102	283	205
Irvine												
Undergraduate	19	56	125	4	6	16	57	112	175	26	85	130
Graduate	3	9	12	1	1	3	12	17	26	7	17	14
Total	22	65	137	5	7	19	69	129	201	33	102	144
Los Angeles**												
Undergraduate	632	830	893	54	130	129	1,315	1,830	1,724	585	890	861
Graduate	265	450	545	29	50	47	313	470	482	144	310	406
Total	897	1,280	1,438	83	180	176	1,628	2,300	2,206	729	1,200	1,267
Riverside												
Undergraduate	65	115	177	13	15	25	44	82	123	74	165	197
Graduate	10	35	20	1	2	5	16	57	33	15	55	50
Total	75	150	217	14	17	30	60	139	156	89	220	247

* Approximately 85% of registered students responded to the questionnaire. At all campuses in 1968 and 1970 and at Berkeley and Los Angeles in 1969 percentages from the survey have been applied to total enrollment. Health Science Interns and Residents are excluded.

** 1969 figures for Los Angeles allocate resident aliens to ethnic groups.

APPENDIX E-4

Campus	Negro			American Indian			Oriental			Mexican or Spanish-American		
	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
San Diego												
Undergraduate	26	55	172	7	9	21	45	91	158	35	84	194
Graduate	7	12	27	3	2	2	16	22	41	9	20	37
Total	33	67	199	10	11	23	61	113	199	44	104	231
San Francisco***												
Undergraduate	2	14	20	1	1	0	26	31	44	3	7	5
Graduate	36	68	95	5	3	5	144	197	217	8	35	53
Total	38	82	115	6	4	5	170	228	261	11	42	58
Santa Barbara												
Undergraduate	128	160	283	19	26	69	259	275	388	123	219	377
Graduate	10	29	35	4	6	14	28	19	28	13	24	60
Total	138	189	318	23	32	83	287	294	416	136	243	437
Santa Cruz												
Undergraduate	28	56	66	6	6	15	66	109	150	30	97	113
Graduate	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	2	4
Total	28	56	69	6	6	15	66	112	154	30	99	117
All Campuses												
Undergraduate	1,456	2,044	2,781	167	277	428	3,794	5,268	5,659	1,186	2,195	2,487
Graduate	519	889	1,214	60	84	107	784	1,277	1,268	301	719	844
Total	1,975	2,933	3,995	227	361	535	4,578	6,545	6,927	1,487	2,914	3,331

***San Francisco data for 1969 were derived from a separate survey and are not comparable with 1968 and 1970 figures.

OAS

March 10, 1971

APPENDIX E-5

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT--PLANNING

Summary of Fall 1968 - Fall 1970 Ethnic Surveys

Campus	Enrollment Surveyed*			Minority** Students					
				Number			Percentage		
	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
Berkeley									
Undergraduate	16,844	18,116	18,822	2,391	3,276	3,738	14.2	18.0	19.9
Graduate	9,101	9,972	9,703	478	827	958	5.3	8.3	9.9
Total	25,985	28,088	28,525	2,869	4,103	4,696	11.0	14.6	16.5
Davis									
Undergraduate	8,697	9,263	9,979	520	952	947	6.0	10.3	9.5
Graduate	2,696	2,964	3,191	87	227	207	3.2	7.7	6.5
Total	11,393	12,227	13,170	607	1,179	1,154	5.3	9.6	8.8
Irvine									
Undergraduate	2,989	3,334	5,054	106	259	446	3.5	7.8	8.8
Graduate	910	933	1,008	23	44	55	2.5	4.7	5.5
Total	3,899	4,267	6,062	129	303	501	3.3	7.1	8.3
Los Angeles***									
Undergraduate	18,722	19,542	18,009	2,586	3,680	3,607	13.8	18.8	20.0
Graduate	9,717	10,338	10,115	751	1,280	1,480	7.7	12.4	14.6
Total	28,439	29,880	28,124	3,337	4,960	5,087	11.7	16.6	18.1
Riverside									
Undergraduate	3,419	3,893	4,673	196	377	542	5.7	9.7	11.6
Graduate	1,155	1,293	1,318	42	149	108	3.6	11.5	8.2
Total	4,574	5,186	5,991	238	526	650	5.2	10.1	10.8

* Approximately 85% of registered students responded to the questionnaire. At all campuses in 1968 and 1970 and at Berkeley and Los Angeles in 1969 percentages from the survey have been applied to total enrollment. Health Science Interns and Residents are excluded.

** Negro, American Indian, Oriental, Spanish or Mexican-American.

***1969 figures for Los Angeles allocate resident aliens to ethnic groups.

Campus	Enrollment* Surveyed			Minority** Students Number			Percentage		
	1969	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
San Diego									
Undergraduate	2,665	2,939	4,310	113	239	545	4.2	8.1	12.6
Graduate	1,089	1,008	1,339	35	56	107	3.2	5.6	8.0
Total	3,754	3,947	5,649	148	295	652	3.9	7.5	11.5
San Francisco****									
Undergraduate	361	349	379	32	53	69	8.9	15.2	18.2
Graduate	1,536	1,487	1,606	193	303	370	12.6	20.4	23.0
Total	1,897	1,836	1,985	225	356	439	11.9	19.4	22.1
Santa Barbara									
Undergraduate	10,581	9,579	11,798	529	680	1,117	5.0	7.1	9.5
Graduate	1,738	1,662	1,846	55	78	137	3.2	4.7	7.4
Total	12,319	11,241	13,644	584	758	1,254	4.7	6.7	9.2
Santa Cruz									
Undergraduate	2,539	2,843	3,495	130	268	344	5.1	9.4	9.8
Graduate	99	148	277	0	5	11	0.0	3.4	4.0
Total	2,638	2,991	3,772	130	273	355	4.9	9.1	9.4
All Campuses									
Undergraduate	66.857	69,858	76,519	6,603	9,784	11,355	9.9	14.0	14.8
Graduate	28,041	29,805	30,403	1,664	2,969	3,433	5.9	10.0	11.3
Total	94,898	99,663	106,922	8,267	12,753	14,788	8.7	12.8	13.8

****San Francisco data for 1969 were derived from a separate survey and are not comparable with 1968 and 1970 figures.

OAS
March 22, 1971

APPENDIX E-7

APPENDIX F

STATEMENT TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE
ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

May 3, 1972

Dr. Kenneth S. Washington

Mrs. Marguerite J. Archie

Mr. Ralph Dawson

Mr. Timothy Knowles

Mr. J. C. Womack

STATEMENT TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

"Give a nigger an inch, and he will take an ell. A nigger should know nothing but to obey his master--to do as he is told. Learning would spoil the best nigger in the world...it would forever unfit him to be a slave. He would at once become unmanageable, and of no value to his master. As to himself, it could do him no good, but a great deal of harm. It would make him discontented and unhappy."[1]

So spoke Frederick Douglass' master, in admonishing his wife to cease further instruction of the young Douglass. The contemporary educational picture for Blacks in the United States is in many ways much as it was in the time of Frederick Douglass. Today the theme is no longer not to educate but to mis-educate and to under-educate the Black masses in order to effectively prevent the growth and the further development of Black awareness. The historical acceptance by whites of the concept that Blacks lack the intellectual capacity to learn and that the involvement of Blacks in educational pursuits automatically leads to failure and frustration still remains today. The blatant manifestations of this assumption has served two purposes: (1) It has made Blacks themselves believe that they should not pursue the goals of higher education and (2) it has served to reinforce the belief of whites that Blacks should not be concerned with formal education but rather concentrate on menial endeavors. Taken in combination, these assumptions have contributed greatly to the inordinate absenteeism of Blacks in higher education.

In the nation as a whole, Black students are not obtaining an equal opportunity for higher education. Research indicates that Black students are not likely to:

- -graduate from high school
- -be eligible for college
- -come from families that can help finance a college student's education
- -receive advice to attend college
- -plan for college
- -think of themselves as having college potential

In California, a state often cited as a model for public higher education, Black students fare no better. The statistics concerning the participation of Black students in the higher education process in this state can only be viewed as confirmation of the state's "hidden agenda" to keep Blacks barefoot and pregnant with illiteracy, frustration and aborted goals. Though Blacks represent 12.5% of the total population of the State of California, they represent only 7.3% of the students enrolled in the senior class in the Fall of 1971.

---

[1] Douglass, Frederick, The Narrative of theLife of Frederick Douglass-An American Slave, Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1968

In the public, tax-supported institutions of higher education in this state, Black students represent the following percentages:

-3.6% at the University of California
-4.8% at the State University and Colleges
-8.4% at the California Community Colleges

By contrast, whites represent 67% of the state population but 76.9% of the senior class in California High Schools. More importantly, they are represented in a disproportionate degree in the public higher education system:

-85.2% at the University of California
-83.9% at the State University and Colleges
-77.9% at the Community Colleges

Given these statistics, several issues become immediately clear. The most critical is that Black students are not surviving in high school long enough to attain a diploma. Many become victims of the racist educational system, perpetuated by the graduates of the California system of public higher education who enter our schools under the guise of teaching but who serve only to maim and sabotage the great potential for growth of our Black students. Black students become the victims of a vicious cycle: Mis-educated by the graduates of the institutions their parents tax dollars support and rendered unable, by the inadequacy of this education, to enter these institutions. Students who make it through in spite of the system or via the poorly funded exception vehicles open to them, find themselves once again exposed to a staff of administrators and faculty that is almost exclusively white.

At the University of California Blacks represent .02% of the professional staff but nearly 1/3 of the service workers and laborers. In 1970 at the State University and Colleges Blacks represented .02% of the instructional faculty and nearly 8% of the custodial, clerical and sub-professional staff. At the California Community Colleges in 1970, Blacks represent 5.5% of the total work force but only .03% of the administrative, teaching and certificated staff.

We present these statistics to the Joint Committee to support our contention that the system of higher education in California has systematically excluded Blacks from participation in the educational process in this state. We believe that it is the legitimate function of this Committee to investigate the educational crimes being perpetuated on our students from the day they enter kindergarten; we further believe that the Joint Committee must use its legislative power to effect the necessary changes in the California educational system to create a system of equal opportunity for all students.

In keeping with these assumptions we wish to make several recommendations to the Joint Committee on the revision of the Master Plan for Higher Education.

I. Our initial premise is that changes in any system must begin at the roots of that system. The source of power, and therefore the potential to make change, is not resident with the administrators of our public institutions, as you would have us believe; rather it rests with those who make the policy for these institutions--the Boards of Regents, the Trustees and the Board of Governors. These are the gatekeepers with the power to decide who will not be educated. It is our

contention that the men who govern public higher education in California do not differ significatly in basic characteristics and attitude about education from the national characteristics of Trustees. A study done by Educational Testing Service in 1969[2] surveyed 10,000 trustees of 536 colleges and universities. The study concluded that the typical trustee is white, male, protestant, between 50 and 60 years old, with a median income of $30,000 to $50,000 per year. The majority of trustees are moderate Republicans. They almost unanimously believe that education is a privilege, not a right. The majority of trustees are not selected because of a major concern with education but because they are able to enhance to financial situation of the institution they represent.

Blacks have no significant representation in this policy making group at any level, including local Boards of Education. Our first recommendation is that the governing boards of public institutions in California be reconstituted so that, on every level, they are representative of the population of this state.

II. Recognizing that great numbers of Black students never get out of secondary schools in California, we recommend that the State Board of Education assume as its major priorities the following concerns:

A. Mandated provisions in every elementary and secondary school in California for parents to participate in the development and execution of policy for the schools which educate their children;

B. A total revision of the Guidance and Counseling system in elementary and secondary schools in California, including an evaluation of the testing procedures utilized to place students in curriculum tracks and including a comprehensive college, career, academic and personal counseling program in every high school in the state;

C. A comprehensive investigation of the issue of school financing and a public report of the findings;

D. The development of a Master Plan for elementary and secondary education which has as its ultimate goals equal educational opportunity for all students in the state.

III. To create real opportunity for participation in higher education in California we recommend that the public sector of higher education assume as its highest priorities the following concerns:

---

[2] Harcness, Rodney T., College and University Trustees, Their Backgrounds, Roles and Educational Attitudes, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, 1969.

The development of new admissions patterns that would broaden the opportunity for equal access to higher education. This could be accomplished by making the following changes in the eligibility criteria:

-the University of California should admit the top 20% of high school graduates; the state university and colleges the next 30% and the junior colleges the bottom 50%.

-the current commitment to a 40-60 lower division/upper division student population should be reversed to facilitate the admission of minority/poor students initially to four year institutions.

-the exception quotas for educationally and economically disadvantaged minority/low income students should be expanded to 10% of admitted students and should be a general exception percentage rather than a specific freshman vs. transfer ratio. We perceive the exception vehicle not as a substitute for a regular admissions procedure but rather as a means by which to illustrate that the existing admissions criteria have little validity in assessing the academic capability of students who are not white and/or affluent. The ability of students in the EOP program, who generally represent the lower half of their high school class, to survive in competition with the top third of California graduates clearly illustrates that the criteria currently used to predict college success are not valid. New criteria must be developed.

-it must be recognized that the junior colleges, in order to meet the needs of the population they are designed to serve, must be able to provide adequate services and financial aid to its students. The chronic lack of financial support for poor students at the junior colleges have created high drop-out rates as students have found that they could not support the costs of this free education.

-finally, it must be recognized that public education in California is not free. The U. S. Office of Education report of the 1971-72 requests from California Institutions for federal financial assistance indicates the following current total costs of attending california public institutions:

California Community Colleges	$1,737
State Univeristy and Colleges	2,384
University of California	2,587

Given the cost of public higher education, it is critical that the issue of financing higher education be thoroughly investigated.

In conclusion, we wish to again state that Blacks have been systematically denied the right to higher educational opportunity through inadequate preparation in the lower grades and subsequent denial of admission to the State University and College system. They are denied admission on the premise that they do not meet established criteria and/or lack basic "entry skills."

Black people have the right and are entitled to equal educational opportunity as are other citizens of this state. A portion of state and federal dollars used in support of higher education is contributed by Black people, these contributions entitle them to, and in part justify, their perusal of advanced study at institutions of higher education since they do help to support these institutions.

As citizens of this country, residents of this state and taxpayers in support of its educational institutions, Black people have a legal and moral right to advanced studies in all instiutions of higher education in the State of California. There is no valid justification for denying Black people higher educational opportunity and the subsequent potential for advancement.

Signed: Dr. Kenneth S. Washington
Assistant Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Mrs. Marguerite J. Archie
Associate Dean, Academic Programs
California State Colleges

Mr. Ralph Dawson
Director, Educational Opportunity Program
California State College, Los Angeles

Mr. Timothy Knowles, Associate Dean
Recruiting Services
University of California, Irvine

Mr. J. C. Womack, Director
Educational Opportunity Program
University of California, Riverside

Representing:

California Association of Afro-American Educators
Black Education Commission, L. A. City Schools
Black Caucus of California Personnel and Guidance Association
Black Educators of Los Angeles

May 3, 1972

STATISTICS RE: MINORITIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION--STATE OF CALIFORNIA 1970-71

Minority Population Representation in California

16.0% Chicano
12.5% Black
2.5% Asian
1.3% Indian

Senior Class Statistics

	Fall 1971 - Grade 12		Fall 1970 - Grade 12	
Indians	1,120	.4%	914	.3%
Black	21,481	7.3%	19,802	7.0%
Oriental	7,236	2.5%	6,750	2.4%
Chicano	35,766	12.1%	32,186	11.4%
Other non-white	2,518	.9%	1,752	1.6%
Other white	226,697	76.9%	220,853	78.2%
Total	294,818		282,259	

Spring 1971 total -- 247,999

Minority Population in College in California

1970-71 U.C.	EOP 5,221	Total	11,286	Total Population	76,133
1970-71 State	8,428		24,589		152,777
1970-71 Private (AICCU)					117,400
1970-71 J.C.			75,287		339,991

Ethnic Breakdown of Minorities in College in California

	1970-71 University*	State Colleges@		1969 Private	(Day Students) Community Colleges [x]	
Black	3.6%	7,317	4.8%	5%	28,599	8.4%
Chicano	3.2%	8,248	5.4%	3%	26,817	7.9%
Asian	7.3%	7,562	5.0%	3%	11,474	3.4%
Indian	0.6%	1,462	1.0%	0.2%	4,115	1.2%
Caucasian	85.2%	128,188	83.9%	88%	264,704	77.9%
Other non-whites					4,282	1.3%
Total minority					75,287	22.1%

* Office of the President, University of California 1-12-72
@ HEW Compliance Report, California State University & Colleges, 1971
[x] Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, May 1, 1972

EMPLOYMENT SURVEY - 1970

The California State University and Colleges

	Total	Male	Female
Total No. Employees	23,513	15,068	8,445
Number of Minorities	2,952	1,984	968
Black	1,120	746	374
Asian	610	368	242
Other non-white	404	325	79
Mexican-American	818	545	273
Caucasian	20,561	13,084	7,477
Instructional Faculty	11,800	9,505	2,295
Minority	1,054	830	224
Black	274	197	77
Asian	338	275	63
Other non-white	193	155	38
Mexican-American	249	203	46
Caucasian	10,746	8,675	2,071
Professional/Administrative	13,368	10,500	2,868
Minority	1,168	903	265
Black	319	228	91
Asian	380	294	86
Other non-white	200	161	39
Mexican-American	269	220	49
Caucasian	12,200	9,597	2,603
All Other Occupations (Clerical, trades, crafts, custodial, etc.)	10,145	4,568	5,577
Minority	1,784	1,081	703
Black	801	518	283
Asian	230	74	156
Other non-white	204	164	40
Mexican-American	549	325	224
Caucasian	8,361	3,487	4,874
Supervisors	1,901	1,163	738
Minority	160	104	56
Black	85	67	18
Asian	38	14	24
Other non-white	13	9	3
Mexican-American	24	14	10
Caucasian	1,741	1,059	697

Source: Employment Survey, Office of the Chancellor, California State University and Colleges, 1970 report

EMPLOYMENT SURVEY - FALL, 1970

California Community Colleges

	Total Number		Admin.	Tech./ Certified	Classified
Mexican-American	1,807	(4.9%)	33	787	987
Black	2,057	(5.5%)	40	847	1,170
Orientals	565	(1.5%)	5	375	185
Indians	74	(0.2%)	2	42	30
Other non-white	141	(0.4%)	0	68	73
Caucasian	32,573	(87.5%)	968.5	22,436	9,168.5
Total	37,217		1,048.5	24,555	11,613
Minority	12.5%		7.6%	8.6%	21.1%

Source: Office of theChancellor, The California Community Colleges, 1970 Report

University Wide Employment Data, April 1971

	Males	Black Males	Females	Black Females
Office/Managers	2,341	82	466	18
Professionals	27,680	568	9,880	326
Technicians	7,099	448	2,694	504
Office/Clerical	6,948	673	17,199	1,682
Craftsmen	2,618	54	83	1
Operatives	1,054	92	99	6
Laborers	1,840	185	780	99
Service Workers	3,425	1,032	1,826	912

Source: EEO - University Wide Employment Data, April 1971 report

APPENDIX G

JOHN M. SMART
Associate Dean, Academic Planning
The California State Colleges

to

DR. DURWARD LONG, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR
Coordinating Council for Higher Education

December 16, 1971

Subject: Ethnic Group Identification
for California State College Students

APPENDIX G-1

The California State Colleges
5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90036

Office of The Chancellor

December 16, 1971

Dr. Durward Long, Associate Director
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
1020-12th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Durward:

You have asked for data concerning the ethnic group identification for California State College students. Attached are data taken from the most recent compliance report to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The figures shown are for fall 1970 and represent full-time students -- those taking 12 or more units. With any survey of this kind, there is a modest discrepancy when comparing the final official enrollment figures of 166,876 full-time students with the total in the HEW survey of 172,162. However, the percentage distribution should be representative of the total full-time student population. It should be noted that the survey does not include part-time students. I would suppose that inclusion of part-time attendees might increase the percentage of minority students.

For comparison purposes, I am enclosing a copy of a chart included in Council Report 1034 which presents 1967 summary data for the State Colleges as well as the other systems.

As I understand it, HEW did not request a survey for fall 1971, and thus we have no fully up-to-date comprehensive systemwide data on hand. If you have any questions, give me a call.

Sincerely,

John M. Smart

John M. Smart
Associate Dean
Academic Planning

JMS:hf
Attachments
cc: Dr. Lee Kerschner
Dr. Edward Credell
Mr. Robert Bess

APPENDIX G-2

TABLE II-1

ETHNIC COMPOSITION, CALIFORNIA
EDUCATION SYSTEMS
1967-68

SYSTEM	MEX-AM %	NEGRO %	AMER.IND. %	ORIENTAL %	WHITE %	OTHER %
University of California						
All students[a]	1.57	2.08	0.24	0.82	N/A	*
Freshmen[b]	N/A	1.5	0.1	6.7	90.6	1.0
California State Colleges						
All students[c]	2.9	2.9	0.7	3.4	N/A	90.1
Freshmen[d]	N/A	0.6	0.3	3.6	94.4	1.2
Junior Colleges						
All students[e]	8.0	6.1	.1	2.8	82.3	.7
Private Colleges & Universities						
All students[f]	N/A	2.8	N/A	N/A	91.1	6.1
Freshmen[g]	N/A	3.1	0.3	4.1	90.6	1.9
California Public Schools[h]	14.3	8.4	.3	2.2	74.2	.7

[a]Office of Analytical Studies, University of California. Survey of fall 1968 enrollment.

[b]ACE, Office of Research. N = 9,604, fall 1967, Freshmen.

[c]Based upon student self-reporting for H.E.W. Civil Rights Compliance Report, fall 1968.

[d]ACE, Office of Research, N = 1,627.

[e]Bureau of Intergroup Relations, State Department of Education, fall 1966 data show some changes: Mex.-Am. = 7.7; Negro = 5.6; Amer. Ind. = .1; Oriental = 2.6; Other and White = 83.1.

[f]1967 U. S. Office of Civil Rights Survey, N = 50,314, 27 institutions reporting.

[g]ACE, Office of Research, N = 3,140.

[h]Bureau of Intergroup Relations.

*0.8 "other" and 7.8 Foreign.

California State Colleges and Universities - Fall, 1970

APPENDIX G-3

SYSTEMWIDE ENROLLMENTS

FTE - STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENT
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	263	1922	1324	2457	21436	29,749
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	191	1353	1007	1321	15398	21,134
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	421	2217	2780	2456	41221	54,656
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	469	1597	2333	1842	37326	47,743
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	1462	7317	7562	8249	128,188	152,772
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	153	342	551	466	12349	13861
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	12	88	78	40	1724	2002
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	187	528	867	589	17214	19385

TOTAL: Undergraduate, Graduate

American Indian:	1,649
Negro:	7,845
Oriental:	8,429
Spanish Surnamed American:	8,838
All Other Students:	145,402
Total All Students:	172,162

Percentage of Total

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENT
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS				(16.1)		
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	1.0	4.8	4.9	5.4	83.9	100.0
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS				(11.2)		
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	1.0	2.7	4.5	3.0	88.8	100.

APPENDIX G-4

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, BAKERSFIELD

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	2	10	1	19	130	162
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS				2	5	7
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	4	15	3	33	212	267
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	1	4	0	8	158	171
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	7	23	7	61	635	733
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	0	12	1	5	75	93
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	0	12	1	5	75	93

CHICO STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
GRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	*	*	*	*	*	1500
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	*	*	*	*	*	1100
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	*	*	*	*	*	3100
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	*	*	*	*	*	2400
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	35	180	75	120	7690	8100
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	*	*	*	*	*	300
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	*	*	*	*	*	800
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	10	20	20	20	1030	1100

* Data not available

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPENDIX G-5

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED P, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
ERGRADUATE RST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	1	50	26	22	195	294
COND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	1	43	22	19	168	253
IRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	3	146	75	64	565	853
OURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	2	89	46	39	343	519
TAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	7	328	169	144	1271	1919
DUATE OR PROFESSIONAL RST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	-	9	3	1	60	73
ECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	2	14	5	2	177	200
TAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	2	23	8	3	237	273

FRESNO STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL AL STUDENT
DERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	26	80	84	138	1645	1973
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	13	73	74	105	1018	1283
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	13	77	181	241	3156	3668
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	20	76	180	198	2376	2850
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	72	306	519	682	8195	9774
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS ALL	3	26	68	72	984	1153
7. ~~SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS~~	---	---	---	---	---	---
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	3	26	68	72	984	1153

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, FULLERTON

II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	60	30	100	1756	1956
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	6	30	10	50	984	1090
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	25	30	100	3083	3248
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	12	15	25	60	2044	2156
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	38	130	95	310	7867	8440
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	2	5	10	20	483	520
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	2	5	10	20	483	520

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, HAYWARD

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	3	145	75	52	1082	1357
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	8	110	51	33	771	973
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	12	207	138	95	2318	2770
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	146	103	50	1641	1950
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	33	608	367	230	5812	7050
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	3	38	48	13	855	957
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	3	38	48	13	855	957
9. Total all full-time students	36	646	415	243	6667	8007

CERTIFICATION

APPENDIX G-7

HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						847
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						764
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						1671
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	89	48	47	52	4457	4693
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	15	8	7	9	838	877
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	15	8	7	9	838	877

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE, KELLOGG-VOORHIS

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	6	160	35	114	1320	1635
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	2	47	35	63	1222	1369
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	11	45	50	68	1711	1885
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	8	42	89	87	2223	2449
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	27	294	209	332	6476	7338
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	1	3	2	2	168	176
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS		2	1	2	83	88
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	1	5	3	4	251	264

APPENDIX G-8

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, LONG BEACH

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	29	278	152	335	2073	2867
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	21	129	95	105	1805	2155
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	20	142	187	187	4379	4915
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	13	76	126	144	4151	4510
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	83	625	560	771	12,408	14,447
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	6	18	52	26	1480	1582
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	6	18	52	26	1480	1582

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, LOS ANGELES

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	17	347	304	494	520	1682
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	13	185	189	224	477	1088
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	54	677	593	575	1843	3742
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	93	559	476	486	2269	3883
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	177	1768	1562	1779	5109	10395
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	19	82	92	77	800	1150
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	4	21	19	16	324	384
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	23	103	111	93	1204	1534

APPENDIX G-9

SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	19	58	55	68	716	916
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	14	52	47	36	193	842
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	36	88	152	111	2525	2912
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	25	96	212	99	2748	3180
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	94	294	466	314	6682	7850
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	11	34	29	28	913	7015
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	11	34	29	28	913	1015

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE, SAN BERNARDINO

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	11	25	3	391	275	353
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	6	14	2	22	158	202
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	17	40	6	62	441	566
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	13	31	5	49	349	447
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	47	110	16	172	1223	1568
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS						

APPENDIX G-10

SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	138	62	154	2231	2595
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~5~~	~~100~~	~~42~~	~~126~~	~~1701~~	~~1974~~
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~21~~	~~135~~	~~107~~	~~209~~	~~5229~~	~~5701~~
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~29~~	~~100~~	~~82~~	~~167~~	~~4936~~	~~5314~~
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	65	473	293	656	14097	15584
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	6	52	17	56	2008	2139
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~	~~0~~
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	71	525	310	712	16105	17723

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~17~~	~~172~~	~~35~~	~~39~~	~~3308~~	~~3631~~
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~25~~	~~165~~	~~29~~	~~126~~	~~1543~~	~~1888~~
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~42~~	~~128~~	~~58~~	~~150~~	~~4437~~	~~4815~~
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~41~~	~~56~~	~~33~~	~~77~~	~~3211~~	~~3424~~
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	~~125~~	~~521~~	~~161~~	~~452~~	~~12499~~	~~13759~~
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~9~~	~~7~~	~~12~~	~~17~~	~~608~~	~~653~~
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	~~3~~	~~13~~	~~5~~	~~7~~	~~345~~	~~373~~
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	12	20	17	24	353	1026

SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	23	90	177	79	1144	1513
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	12	147	192	92	764	1207
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	223	543	140	2643	3559
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	20	146	348	85	2012	2611
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	65	606	1260	396	6563	8890
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	---	---	---	---	---	---
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	---	---	---	---	---	---
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	12	78	218	65	2051	2422

SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE 1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	40	205	186	279	2,090	2,800
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	34	194	123	232	1,538	2,121
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	87	218	458	287	4,652	5,702
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	115	121	415	176	4,888	5,715
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	276	738	1,182	974	13,168	16,338
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL 6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	58	79	239	129	2,664	3,169
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	58	79	239	129	2,664	3,169

APPENDIX G-12

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE, SAN LUIS OBISPO

PART II - STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	27	57	86	55	2197	2422
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	15	30	85	54	2055	2239
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	24	17	162	61	2514	2778
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	30	20	152	74	2834	3110
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	96	124	485	244	9600	10549
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	6	3	10	9	477	505
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	6	3	10	9	477	505

SONOMA STATE COLLEGE

PART II – STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	20	5	20	413	468
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	8	20	4	13	215	260
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	22	19	18	28	1,373	1,460
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	14	10	13	20	715	772
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	54	69	40	81	2,747	2,991
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	10	4	5	11	580	610
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS						
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	10	4	5	11	580	610

11.

STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE

PART II - STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA (FALL TERM)

ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS. IF THERE ARE NO PERSONS IN THE INDICATED GROUP, ENTER ZERO (0) IN THE SPACE PROVIDED	AMERICAN INDIAN	NEGRO	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICAN	ALL OTHER STUDENTS	TOTAL ALL STUDENTS
UNDERGRADUATE						
1. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	12	27	8	38	341	426
2. SECOND YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	8	14	7	19	251	299
3. THIRD YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	35	15	19	45	740	854
4. FOURTH & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	17	10	18	23	487	555
5. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS	72	66	52	125	1,819	2,134
GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL						
6. FIRST YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	7	--	4	4	131	146
7. SECOND & SUBSEQUENT YEAR FULL-TIME STUDENTS	--	--	--	--	--	--
8. TOTAL NUMBER FULL-TIME GRADUATE OR PROFESSIONAL STUDENTS	7	--	4	4	131	146

APPENDIX H

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Resolutions Adopted February 20, 1969

Ethnic Programs

APPENDIX H-1

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

ETHNIC PROGRAMS

WHEREAS, Community College students are a cross section of American society and should have access to a balanced educational program; and

WHEREAS, Afro-American studies and other culturally related studies will provide Community College students with a better understanding and knowledge about these cultures; and

WHEREAS, Many Community Colleges are developing ethnic programs; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Governors urges all Community College districts to offer such ethnic programs and further suggests to the districts that these programs be offered and promoted so that they are available to all students.

Certified adopted: February 20, 1969

APPENDIX H-2

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STANDARD DESIGNATED SUBJECTS TEACHING CREDENTIAL
FOR MEXICAN-AMERICAN STUDIES

RESOLVED, That the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges adopts the following Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential in Mexican-American Studies and that this Credential be adopted as an emergency regulation to take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State as provided in Section 11422(c) of the Government Code.

A resolution by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges to add Article 4 (commencing with Section 50070) to Chapter 6 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, relating to a Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential in Mexican-American Studies.

Be it resolved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, acting under the authority of Education Code Sections 193, 197, 8352, and 8353 and pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, that:

Chapter 1. Article 4 (commencing with Section 50070) is added to Chapter 6 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code, to read:

50070. Definition. For the purposes of this article, "Mexican-American Studies" means the study of the Mexican-American Community, its people, politics, culture, philosophy, art, music, literature, economics, history, and social development.

Sec. 2. Section 50071 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50071. Specific Requirement for Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential. The specific requirement for the Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential in Mexican-American Studies to be used in grades 13 and 14 is that described as follows:

(a) A master's degree with a major in Mexican-American studies.

Sec. 3. Section 50072 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50072. Specific Requirements for Provisional Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential in Mexican-American Studies include all of the following:

(a) An applicant for the credential shall comply with the requirements of Article 3 of Subchapter 18 of Chapter 1 of Title 5 and submit with his application a statement of need described in Section 6649 and a statement of intent similar to the one described in Section 6198.

(b) A baccalaureate degree earned in a college or university approved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges.

(c) Submission of the applicant's written statement that he intends to complete all the requirements for the Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential with a specialization in Mexican-American studies.

(d) A recommendation from the institution granting the degree that the applicant possesses the potential of becoming a successful teacher of Mexican-American studies and has the maturity, poise, and resourcefulness needed to teach under special supervision at the present time. The institution may appoint a lay committee to advise the institution concerning such potential and attributes of the applicant.

(e) Verification by the institution granting the degree that the applicant has had special practical experience in Mexican-American activities which have contributed materially to the improvement of his school or community and which will contribute to his success as a teacher. The lay committee may be utilized to advise the institution concerning the relevance of such experiences.

(d) Submission of a written statement made by an official of a school district that the applicant will be employed in that district maintaining a Community College to serve with that credential, if granted, under the special supervision of a master teacher or department chairman.

Sec. 4. Section 50073 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50073. District governing boards maintaining a Community College must adopt minimum course requirements, in accordance with educational programs approved by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, needed by instructors of Mexican-American studies in their district.

Sec. 5. Section 50074 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50074. District governing boards maintaining a Community College may adopt baccalaureate equivalencies for Mexican-American studies instructors, and must submit such equivalencies to the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges for approval.

Sec. 6. Section 50075 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50075. Authorization for Service. A credential issued under this article authorizes the holder to teach Mexican-American studies in the district that executed the statement of need, in Community Colleges, and in class organized primarily for adults, subject, however, to the condition that the teaching be performed under the special supervision of a master teacher or department chairman.

Sec. 7. Section 50076 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50076. Renewal. A credential issued under this article shall be renewed as herein specified if the applicant has fulfilled the

requirements of Education Code Section 13132 and, during the term of the credential to be renewed (or during the summer session following if the application for renewal has been filed before the expiration date of the credential), has completed the following amounts of any remaining required course work for the applied credential:

(a) A first renewal, valid for a two-year period--twelve semester hours of course work.

(b) Each subsequent renewal, valid for a two-year period--twenty-four additional hours of course work.

Sec. 8. Section 50077 is added to Article 4 of Chapter 6 of said title to read:

50077. Time and Circumstances. Before July 1, 1972, but not thereafter, a Provisional Standard Designated Subjects Teaching Credential in Mexican-American Studies, valid for two years, may be granted under the circumstances described in both (a) and (b):

(a) When in the judgment of the Committee of Credentials, a certified person holding an appropriate teaching credential is not available.

(b) The district superintendent who needs to employ the person executes a statement of need similar to that described in Section 6649.

FINDING OF EMERGENCY

The California Community Colleges finds that an emergency exists and that that the foregoing regulation is necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety or general welfare. A statement of the facts constituting such emergency is:

> With the fall semester of the Community Colleges about to begin, and in order to insure that they will have instructors to teach Mexican-American Studies, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges takes this emergency action to add Article 4 to Chapter 6 of Title 5 of the California Administrative Code.

The said regulation is therefore adopted as an emergency regulation to take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State as provided in Section 11422(c) of the Government Code.

This regulation submitted for filing does not include any "building standard," as defined in the State Building Standards Law (Sections 18000-18917, Health and Safety Code).

Certified Adopted: September 17, 1969

SOME NOTES ON STANDARDS FOR CHICANO STUDIES

Any discussion of Chicano Studies today must keep in mind that these academic programs are still in very early stages of development. Nearly all of the programs today are formulated on the basis set forth in El Plan de Santa Barbara. This plan was developed by Chicano scholars and activists as a means of establishing a first step towards setting standards for Chicano Studies. Since the writing of the plan Chicanos who have been part of the Chicano Studies Programs have been fully occupied with the problems of their own campuses in the implementation of programs and curricula. All of the campuses have developed programs that are tailored to their individual needs and as these programs and curricula have continued to mature there has been no effort of the magnitude and scope of the Plan de Santa Barbara to refine Chicano Studies. The nearest attempt was the Long Beach Conference on Chicano Studies but its foci were programmatic and procedural concerns such as student recruitment, hiring, student relations, etc. There has been no major effort to deal with curricular development or refinement in a philosophical or academic sense. There have been a number of institutes but they also have not attempted to do a comprehensive analysis. Most activities have been intended to prepare faculty members or to expose people to some of the newer developments in ideas and literature as they relate to Chicanos. To date the effort to standardize curricular offerings has been an ad hoc activity carried out by Chicanos who create or use whatever opportunity they have to accomplish inter-campus coordination.

The reader must keep in mind that time and resources have limited the extent to which this study has been able to review or investigate the various topics at hand. Chicano Studies or ethnic studies require a major research activity for a precise analysis. As noted in the above paragraph and in the text virtually every campus in the State has curricular offerings in Chicano Studies and many of these are individually tailored to meet the specific campus' needs. The curricula vary from inter-disciplinary survey courses to courses in specific disciplines such as History, Language, Sociology, Political Science, etc. There are a sufficient number of differences from campus to campus that generalities about Chicano Studies curricula or programs must be used with a great deal of caution. It is also true that because Chicano Studies are in such a dynamic state of early development, an equal amount of caution must be employed when one attempts to extrapolate from the present experience. Any comment, for example, on the quality or virtue of a given program or curricular offering must incorporate the understanding that the same may not be true come the subsequent term.

Public higher education in California has the responsibility to facilitate the refinement of specific curricula and the coordination of standardization. This can be done by engaging in a number of activities. First, there must be a comprehensive analysis of existing curricula. Second, there must be new effort to define or re-define as the case may be the objectives and goals of Chicano Studies. Finally, a "master plan" must be articulated that ensures maximum coordination on a statewide basis. These activities should be carried out by the CCHE with maximum participation by Chicanos in higher education. In this instance as well as in those other instances where we refer to maximum participation by Chicanos our intention is that Chicanos would be participating on <u>all</u> levels of activity.

APPENDIX I

ROBERT E. KENNEDY
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

to

C. MANSEL KEENE, VICE CHANCELLOR
Faculty and Staff Affairs

June 30, 1972

Response to FSA 72-46

February 3, 1972

Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Policy and Program

February 1, 1972

Affirmative Action Program
of
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

State of California

Memorandum

California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

To : C. Mansel Keene, Vice Chancellor
Faculty and Staff Affairs

Date : June 30, 1972

File No.:

Copies :

From : Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Response to FSA 72-46

RECEIVED
VICE CHANCELLOR
FACULTY & STAFF AFFAIRS
JUL 03 1972
Trustees California University
and Colleges

Our Affirmative Action Program was formalized by the release of my memorandum dated February 3, 1972 on the subject of Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Policy and Program. In this memorandum, responsibility for assuring overall implementation of the program was delegated to the Vice President for Administrative Affairs and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. School deans and division heads were assigned the responsibility of providing leadership in their respective areas in the recruitment, training and promotion of minorities and women. The appointment of a full-time Affirmative Action Coordinator in the Personnel Office and the establishment of an Affirmative Action Compliance Committee were additional measures taken in establishing the program. The function of the Compliance Committee is to oversee the program, advise the President on progress, and make recommendations for program improvement or revision. The Coordinator is responsible for monitoring the program, establishing contact with minority and women's organizations for the purpose of recruitment, and assisting management in implementing the program. An additional implementing step was the assignment of an Affirmative Action Facilitator within each school or division to act as liaison with the Coordinator and the Committee, and to provide information or reports as needed.

Subsequent to the release of the policy statement on affirmative action three implementing memoranda were issued. The first contained a stipulation that, of the faculty positions allocated for the 1972-73 academic year, two percent within each school were reserved for qualified or qualifiable minorities or women.* The second memorandum, issued on March 14 in an effort to obtain accurate statistical data on our current minority and female employment, invited all employees to voluntarily indicate his or her ethnic identity and sex. In a memorandum dated March 15, departments and schools or divisions were instructed to develop Affirmative Action Plans. Each plan must include a statement concerning the present status of minority and female employment as well as goals and time-tables for improving the representation of these groups in each organizational unit. The restriction was also imposed that, until the employing unit had an approved Affirmative Action Plan, no position vacancies could be filled with other than minority individuals without my approval. The Compliance Committee is now in the process of reviewing these plans and making recommendations to me.

Attachments: Memoranda
1) Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Policy and Program 2/3/72
2) Release of Faculty Positions, 2/4/72
3) Voluntary Self-Identification Survey, 3/14/72
4) Affirmative Action Plans, 3/15/72

(*The remaining balance of this 2% reserve was released to the schools in early June; they are still considered to be under our Affirmative Action Program.)

State of California

Memorandum

California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

To : All Faculty and Staff

Date : February 3, 1972

File No.:

Copies :

RECEIVED
VICE CHANCELLOR
FACULTY & STAFF AFFAIRS
JUL 03 1972
Trustees California University
and Colleges

From : Robert E. Kennedy

Subject: Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Policy and Program

As a reaffirmation of this college's equal employment opportunity policy, I am formally announcing the establishment of an Affirmative Action Program for California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo. The attached plan is an interim statement on affirmative action and reflects a continuing commitment to a policy of nondiscrimination with respect to the employment of women and minorities. The basic goal of the Affirmative Action Program is the more extensive employment of women and minority group members.

Although we may take some credit for good intentions and modest accomplishments, the college must embark on a more active program if it is to achieve the goal of full and equal employment opportunity for members of ethnic minority groups and women. The record reveals that several departments and units on campus have no, or only very limited, minority ethnic representation in the work force. Greater assurance is needed that in all areas of the college, including auxiliary organizations, efforts are being made to employ not only qualified but qualifiable minority persons and women. The ethnic distribution report for Cal Poly employees in 1965-66 reported Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, with 21 minority employees out of a total of 704, or approximately 3%. In April, 1971, the records show that ethnic minorities currently fill 68 of the 1357 regular positions on the campus, or approximately 5%. Cal Poly has 29 faculty, 15 technical and clerical, 16 trades, crafts, and protective services, and 8 administrative employees from these groups.

As the result of this review of the campus situation, I am today taking action to reaffirm and extend our policies on nondiscrimination, and to commit Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, to a program of affirmative action designed to further the college's progress as an equal opportunity employer. All of us, as the members of the college community, share the responsibility to make equal opportunity an actual, functioning condition of life at this college.

I am asking the Academic Senate and the Staff Senate as well as the line organization to provide me, by the fall quarter 1972, an evaluation of the effectiveness of the implementing steps that we will be taking in order to make the program successful. In the interim, until the beginning of the 1972 fall quarter, the attached statement will be the official policy and procedures to be followed in connection with Affirmative Action. I am making the interim program operational so that every person in the total organization will have the opportunity to read and understand the concepts of Affirmative Action and assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the implementing steps. It is hoped that out of this will grow an even better set of procedures which will more effectively implement the concept.

This policy must be implemented throughout the college organization and is the responsibility of all departments and personnel, supervisory and nonsupervisory. The particular ways in which this policy and its implicit goals are to be achieved are the essence of the college's Affirmative Action Program.

Attachment

APPENDIX I-5

February 1, 1972

Affirmative Action Program

of

California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

This Affirmative Action Program, or any part thereof, is developed with the intent of complying in good faith with all State and Federal laws, rules, and regulations including Executive Order 11246 as amended by Executive Order 11375, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and in compliance with Title 41 CFR-60-2 (Revised Order No. 4); and to reaffirm the college's policy of providing Equal Employment Opportunity for all persons without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, sex or age, except where sex or age is a bona fide qualification.

PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

A. Concept

"Affirmative Action" is a concept developed at the national level as a positive means of implementing equal employment opportunity for all employees without regard to race, color, religion, national origin, sex, or age. Cal Poly's Affirmative Action Program is a set of specific and result-oriented procedures to which the college commits itself to apply every good faith effort. This program is in response to the fact that an informal attempt to comply with the concept of equal opportunity has failed to produce sufficient improvement in the employment of women, or of minority race members. This means that the college must now make a more formal effort to recruit qualified and qualifiable people among ethnic minority groups and women to fill jobs in all areas of operations, both academic and non-academic.

The concept of the Affirmative Action Program includes a variety of activities that go beyond passive non-discrimination. It is concerned with the details of where we are now, where we should be, and how to get there. Affirmative Action demands immediate, imaginative and sustained effort to devise recruitment, training and career advancement programs that will result in wider minority and women representation on campus. It also requires frequent evaluation and analysis to insure that we are in fact maintaining a reasonably accelerated rate of progress towards our immediate and long-range goals.

B. Objectives and Goals

The objective of the Affirmative Action Program is equal employment opportunity.

As a long range goal, this Affirmative Action Program is designed to bring about an employee balance in ethnic and male/female groups which approximates that of the work force in the recruiting area of the college. The normal recruiting area of the college for staff positions (non-academic) is defined as the area within which the college can expect people to commute. For purposes of this document the recruiting area for staff is San Luis Obispo County except when recruitment could reasonably be done beyond the commuting area. For faculty and administrative positions the normal recruiting area is defined as the state of California, except when there are insufficient candidates in the state.

As an immediate goal, it is expected that each department, division, school, auxiliary organization and other employment unit of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, will demonstrate a significant effort to increase the minority race and women employee numbers in accordance with developed goals and time tables.

C. Implementation of Goals

In the implementation of these goals, greater assurance is needed that in all areas of the college, including auxiliary organizations, efforts are being made to hire not only qualified but qualifiable* minority persons and women with more attention being given in the staff areas to the promotion of individuals from these groups to supervisory vacancies which occur on campus, and in the faculty area to the identification and recruitment of these persons for roles of academic leadership. In working to achieve these goals, particular attention should be given to the matter of appointing qualifiable applicants to these positions when qualified applicants are not available. This should include provisions for programs, where necessary, to give qualifiable entry-level personnel experience and training that will open opportunities for promotion to advanced level vacancies that may occur.

D. Responsibility for Implementation

The responsibility for assuring the Affirmative Action Program's implementation has been delegated by the President to the Vice President for Administrative Affairs and the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

School Deans and Division Heads will provide the leadership for their respective school or division. The Affirmative Action Coordinator** shall be responsible for providing a monitoring procedure as well as assistance to all management and supervisory personnel in administering specific affirmative action efforts for each organizational component. The President will appoint a Committee on Affirmative Action Compliance to oversee the general implementation of the Affirmative Action Program. This committee will be advisory to the President and will review the Affirmative Action Program at regular intervals and advise the President on the progress of implementation by the employment units of the college as well as on needed improvements and revisions in the program and its goals. In addition, the committee will work closely with interested on-campus and off-campus personnel and organizations. An Affirmative Action Facilitator++ should be appointed from each division and school to act as a liaison with the Affirmative Action Coordinator and the Affirmative Action Compliance Committee and to provide information or reports as needed.

As a general rule, all administrators and supervisors, including those in auxiliary organizations, should initiate and develop procedures within their immediate areas which will insure not only a higher proportion of appointments of minorities and women, but equal opportunity to promotion,

*This term is synonymous with "requisite skills" and for staff personnel refers to the level of achievement necessary to be accepted into occupational entry jobs with minor training and orientation. For faculty it means the establishment of optimum conditions to allow the person to achieve the existing standards of the department within a reasonable period of time.

**Currently filled position in the Personnel Office.

++To be appointed by each Dean or Division Head for that school or division.

equal treatment and development of the potential of minorities and women at all levels of work within the college and its related activities. As an immediate objective each school, division and department shall develop specific written goals and objectives, including target dates which, when needed, will reflect a substantial advance from where that unit is at present. It is understood that the ability to attain these goals and objectives is dependent upon the availability of qualified and/or qualifiable minority and women applicants.

Compliance with this program will be measured by good faith actions and by the rate of progress towards our immediate and long range goals. Failure by departments, units, divisions and schools to make satisfactory progress in achieving realistic goals within the time table established will result in review of budgetary and position allocations and of administrative performance. One of the purposes of this review is for redefining goals and time tables to correct underutilization of minorities and women. Failure by the college to comply with standards established by Federal Legislation on affirmative action can result in suspension of federal grants and moneys and in other sanctions.

E. Areas of Responsibility

Affirmative Action Coordinator

1. Encourage and actively seek minority and women applicants for positions in the college;

2. Assist all schools, divisions and departments in developing goals and objectives for affirmative action and the time tables for accomplishing such goals and objectives;

3. Provide all areas having significant underutilization with methods and means by which they might implement their goals within their time tables;

4. Make necessary surveys and analysis of the college's minority employment including women composition of the faculty and staff areas;

5. Provide information on organizations and facilities involved in the training and education of minority and women personnel who would have requisite skills to schools, divisions, departments and other units;

6. Continue the Annual Ethnic and Women Employment Survey;

7. Request from the Chancellor's Office waiver of experience or other qualifications for minority and women applicants who demonstrate requisite skills and are qualifiable;

8. Insure that all college employment advertisements, manuals, pamphlets, etc., include the wording "affirmative action employer"; and

9. Contact and work closely with organizations and agencies which can be helpful in referring minority group and women applicants.

Division Heads and Deans (Department Heads, Directors and Supervisors Where Appropriate)

1. Recommend or appoint minority and women applicants who are qualified or qualifiable to existing vacancies whenever possible;

2. Provide on-the-job training for minorities and women who have requisite skills and are qualifiable;

3. Make particular efforts to recommend and promote, whenever possible, presently employed minority and women personnel who have requisite skills to an advance-level vacancy in their respective areas;

4. Appoint one Affirmative Action Facilitator from each division and school to serve as a liaison with the Affirmative Action Compliance Committee and the Affirmative Action Coordinator in the development and implementation of the units' goals and time tables.

5. Provide the Affirmative Action Coordinator and the Affirmative Action Compliance Committee with information pertaining to progress within their areas, noting the positive efforts as well as deficiencies on the part of subordinate units to participate and cooperate in the implementation of their goals and time tables.

F. Dissemination of Policies and Statements

1. Internal Dissemination
   a. The policy of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) and the Federal Notice of Equal Employment Opportunity have been posted in areas adjacent to Personnel bulletin boards and at the point of receipt of application for employment.
   b. The EEO Clause Statement* will be placed at the heading of Position Vacancy Announcements in the Cal Poly Report.
   c. The Affirmative Action Policy Statement will be included in the College Administrative Manual.
   d. Special meetings will be conducted periodically with executive, management, and supervisory personnel as well as the Academic and Staff Senates to explain the intent of the Affirmative Action Policy and individual responsibility for effective implementation. The supportive attitude of the President of Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, of the Affirmative Action Program will be made clear.

*Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, is an Affirmative Action Employer.

2. External Dissemination
   a. The EEO Clause will be placed on all faculty and staff application forms.
   b. The Affimative Action Policy Statement will be forwarded to all agencies on our recruitment roster including agencies in direct contact with minority individuals and women.
   c. The Affirmative Action Policy Statement will be forwarded to local community colleges as a potential recruitment source for minorities and women.
   d. The Affirmative Action Policy Statement will be forwarded to colleges containing concentrations of specific minorities and women.
   e. Incorporate the "Affirmative Action Employer" clause in all purchase orders, leases and contracts; notifying in writing all sub-contractors, vendors and suppliers of this College policy; and, insuring that contractors, sub-contractors and vendors comply with all Affirmative Action legally required of them to do business with the College.
   f. Organizations such as the Department of Human Resources and Development will be notified of our policy. They will be encouraged to refer minority and women applicants for open positions.

G. Existing College Equal Opportunity Programs

In the context of equal employment as it relates to our Affirmative Action Program, Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, is currently involved in: (1) A Minority Training Program to employ, train and promote minority group members in clerical and other capacities; (2) A program coordinated with the local Economic Opportunity Commission called "Operation Mainstream" providing trainee positions in the areas of management, technical, clerical, health, grounds and building trades. When positions are available at the end of the trainee's period, he or she is given equal consideration for regular positions at the college.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Affirmative Action	-	A comprehensive result-oriented personnel program designed to increase the employment of minorities and women
Underutilization	-	Having fewer minorities and women in a particular job classification than would reasonably be expected by their availability
Job Classification	-	One or a group of jobs having similar content, wage rates and opportunities
Recruiting Area	-	The area from which the College can reasonably recruit minorities and women. For the purposes of this document the recruiting area for non-academic employees is San Luis Obispo County except when there are insufficient candidates available in this geographic area; for academic and administrative positions, the recruiting area is the State of California except when there are insufficient candidates available in the state.
Qualifiable	-	1) Staff: minority and women applicants who have limited former experience but who have education, skills and references which indicate potential for successful full-time employment 2) Faculty: minority and female applicants who have Bachelors or Masters degrees who indicate, from their background, training and education, that they could add to the College's instructional program and advance toward the terminal degree

APPENDIX J

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

Spring 1972

TABULATION OF RESPONSES

APPENDIX J-1

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

Spring 1972
(Tabulation presented as percentage of total respondents: 145)

This is a study sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the California State Legislature. The response to this questionnaire will assist the legislature in understanding the condition of the Mexican American and higher education in California. Please fill out the answers and return the completed questionnaire immediately. Your answers will be strictly confidential. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. Have you ever spoken directly to a counselor at your high school about going to college?

   Yes 82.1% No 17.9%
   (Circle one)

2. Have you ever spoken to a teacher at your high school about going to college?

   Yes 73.8% No 26.2%
   (Circle one)

3. If you have discussed college with a teacher or counselor from your high school, which college(s) were mentioned?

   SEE SCHEDULE J-3 attached

   (enter name of college)

4. How many of your friends would you say spoke directly to a counselor or teacher about going to college?

   none 3.4% some 57.9% most 38.6%
   (Circle one)

5. Did you personally speak with or hear from any college representative(s) who were recruiting for their college(s)?

   Yes 70.3% No 29.7%
   (Circle one)

6. If you did hear from or speak to college representative(s), what college(s) did the person(s) represent?

   SEE SCHEDULE J-6 attached

   (enter name of college(s)

7. If college representative(s) did come to your school, did they discuss opportunities for Mexican-American students?

   Yes 59.3% No 20.7%
   (Circle one)

   (20.7% No Response attributed to those who said "I don't know" or who may have indicated no representative appeared on campus.)

HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES QUESTIONNAIRE (cont)

8. How can students at your high school best be informed about college opportunities or that a college representative is coming to the high school?

See SCHEDULE J-8 attached

(If you need more space, please use back of this sheet.)

9. Did you apply to college?

Yes 82.1% No 17.2%

No Response .7%

(Circle one)

10. If you did apply to college, how many did you apply to?

1 2 3 4 5 or more

(Circle one)

See Schedule J-10 attached

11. Are you planning to attend college in September?

Yes 81.4% No 16.6%

No Response 2.1%

(Circle one)

12. If you are going to college in September, which college are you going to?

See Schedule J-12 attached

(enter name of college)

13. Why did you choose the college you plan to attend?

a.	On the advice of a teacher?	No Response 30.3%	Yes 23.4%	No 46.2%
b.	On the advice of a counselor?	No Response 24.1%	Yes 40.0%	No 35.9%
c.	On the advice of your parents?	No Response 24.1%	Yes 42.8%	No 33.1%
d.	On the advice of a relative other than parents?	28.3%	Yes 13.8%	No 57.9%
e.	On the advice of a friend?	No Response 28.3%	Yes 24.8%	No 46.9%
f.	Because a friend(s) are going to the same college?	26.9%	Yes 15.9%	No 57.2%
g.	Because of a college recruiter?	No Response 29.7%	Yes 20.0%	No 50.3%
h.	Because of money	No Response 21.4%	Yes 50.3%	No 28.3%
i.	Because of the distance from home?	No Response 20.7%	Yes 53.1%	No 26.2%
j.	Because it was the only college where you were accepted?	No Response 29.7%	Yes 13.8%	No 56.5%

14. Were you in a college preparatory "track" in your high school?

Yes 57.3% No 38.6%

No Response 4.1%

(Circle one)

Please feel free to add any comments you might have about the subject of this questionnaire.

SCHEDULE J-3

If you have discussed college with a teacher or counselor from your high school, which college(s) were mentioned:

Citrus Junior College	22.7%	U.C. Irvine	3.8%
San Jose State	15.9	U.C. Berkeley	3.0
San Jose City	13.6	L.B. State	3.0
Ventura City	12.0	Yale University	3.0
L.A. State	10.6	Moorpark College	3.0
Bakersfield (unspec.)	9.4	U.S.C.	3.0
Mt. San Antonio	9.1	San Francisco State	2.3
Cal Poly (unspec.)	9.1	L.A. Trade Tech	2.3
U.C.L.A.	6.8	Chaffey J. C.	2.3
Santa Clara Univ.	6.0	Cal Poly, Pomona	2.3
S.F.V.S.C.	6.0	Univ. Cal. (unspec.)	1.5
La Verne University	4.5	U.C. Davis	1.5
Occidental College	4.5	U.C. Santa Cruz	1.5
U.C. Santa Barbara	4.5	U.C. Riverside	1.5
San Diego State	4.5	Sawyer Business College	1.5
St. College (unspec.)	4.5	Fresno State	1.5
No College Named	4.5	Claremont Colleges	1.5
Stanford University	3.8	Pepperdine College	1.5
Cal Poly, S.L.O.	3.8	Loyola University	1.5
E.L.A. City College	3.8	Redlands University	1.5
Bakersfield J.C.	3.8	Miscellaneous	15.2

SCHEDULE J-6

If you did hear from or speak to college representative(s), what college(s) did the person(s) represent?

San Jose State	18.6%	U.C. Santa Clara	4.9%
Citrus J. C.	14.7	Bakersfield City	4.9
L.A. State	9.8	Ventura City	4.9
San Jose City	9.8	Bakersfield State	3.9
U.C.L.A.	7.8	Moorpark City	2.9
Occidental	6.9	Chaffey J.C.	2.9
U.C. Irvine	6.9	Claremont Colleges	2.9
U.C. San Diego	6.9	Redlands	2.0
Yale	6.9	Pepperdine	2.0
No College Named	5.9	Mt. San Antonio	2.0
U.S.C.	5.9	L.B. State	2.0
Cal Poly	5.9	State College (unspec.)	2.0
La Verne	5.9	Nothing Special	2.0
U.C. Riverside	5.9	Miscellaneous	20.6
E.L.A. City College	5.9		
San Fernando State	5.9		

SCHEDULE J-8

How can students at your high school best be informed about college opportunities, or that a college representative is coming to the high school?

Bulletins	35.2%
Counselors keep student informed	35.2
College representative visits	18.6
Teachers keep student informed	17.9
Counselors know individual student needs	13.8
More advance notice	11.0
P.A. system	10.3
School assemblies for college representatives	8.3
Counselors keep abreast of college information	6.9
Special meetings of students to discuss college	6.9
More informative Chicano student recruitment	5.5
Pamphlets/literature	4.8
Individual appointments with college representatives	4.8
Counselors send letters to parents	3.4
School newspaper	2.8
Posters	2.1
Special college counselors/advisors	2.1
Counselors inform before senior year	2.1
College students (former)	2.1
Films	1.4
Counselors notify senior classes	1.4
Government teachers keep student informed	1.4
Miscellaneous	1.4
Don't know	9.0

SCHEDULE J-12

If you are going to college in September, which college are you going to?

Citrus J.C.	19.5%
San Jose City College	11.9
Ventura City College	11.9
L.A. Trade Tech	8.0
San Jose State	5.9
L.A. State	4.2
Cal Poly, S.L.O.	3.4
U.C. Santa Clara	3.4
Cal Poly, Pomona	2.5
Mt. San Antonio	2.5
E.L.A. City College	2.5
Chaffey J.C.	2.5
La Verne	1.7
U.C. Santa Barbara	1.7
U.C. Irvine	1.7
Sawyer Business College	1.7
Miscellaneous	7.6

APPENDIX K

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN

Academic Year 1972-73

TABULATION OF RESPONSES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN - ACADEMIC YEAR 1972-73

(Tabulation presented as percentage of total respondents: 134)

This is a study sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the California State Legislature. The response to the questionnaire will assist the legislature in understanding the condition of the Mexican American and higher education in California. The questionnaire is divided into two parts. Part one refers to your high school experience. Please answer these as best you can. Part two refers to the last academic year and is intended to get your impressions of your experience in higher education. Please fill out the answers and return the completed questionnaire immediately. Your answers will be strictly confidential. Thank you for your cooperation.

PART I

1. In high school did you ever speak directly to a counselor about going to college?
   No Response .7%

   Yes 63.4% No 35.8%
   (circle one)

2. In high school, did you ever speak directly to a teacher about going to college?

   Yes 57.5% No 42.5%
   (circle one)

3. If you discussed college with a teacher or counselor from your high school, which colleges were mentioned?

   SEE SCHEDULE K-3/K6 attached

4. How many of your friends in high school would you say spoke directly to a counselor or teacher about going to college?
   No Response 1.5%

   None 9.9% Some 59.7% Most 29.8%
   (Circle one)

5. Did you personally speak with or hear from any college representative(s) who were recruiting for their college?

   Yes 56.7¢ No 43.3%
   (Circle one)

6. If you did hear from or speak to a college representative while you were in high school, what college did the person represent?

   SEE SCHEDULE K-3/K6 attached

7. If college representative(s) did come to your school, did they discuss opportunities for Mexican-American students? No Response 3.9%

   Yes 75% No 21.1%
   (circle one)

8. How do you think students in high school can best be informed about college opportunities or that a college representative(s) is coming to the high school?

SEE SCHEDULE K-8 ATTACHED

9. How many colleges did you apply to?

One	Two	Three	Four	Five
53.0%	25.4%	14.2%	6.7%	.7%

10. Why did you choose the college you finally attended?

		No Response			
a.	On the advice of a teacher?	32.1%	Yes 13.4$	No	54.5%
b.	On the advice of a counselor?	29.8	Yes 23.9	No	46.3
c.	On the advice of your parents?	30.6	Yes 22.4	No	47.0
d.	On the advice of a relative other than parents?	32.1	Yes 17.9	No	50.0
e.	On the advice of a friend?	31.3	Yes 26.9	No	41.8
f.	Because of friend(s) going to the same college?	27.6	Yes 20.1	No	52.2
g.	Because of a college recruiter?	29.1	Yes 16.4	No	54.5
h.	Because of money?	20.9	Yes 49.2	No	29.8
i.	Because of the distance from home?	24.6	Yes 53.7	No	21.6
j.	Because it was the only college where you were accepted?	27.6	Yes 18.7	No	53.7

(Circle one)

11. Did you take college preparatory course when you were in high school?

1.5% Yes 66.4% No 32.1%

(Circle one)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN - PART II

1. What college do you attend? — SEE SCHEDULE K-3/K-6 attached

2. Do you plan to complete college? — No Response 4.5% — Yes 88.8% No 6.7% (Circle one)

3. Do you plan to finish college where you are presently attending? — 7.5% — Yes 65.7% No 26.9% (Circle one)

4. List the five things that you liked most about your first year in college. — SEE SCHEDULE K-4 attached

5. List the five things that you disliked most about your first year in college. — SEE SCHEDULE K-5 attached

6. How would you describe the way in which you are treated by the faculty at your college? — 4.5% — Well 33.6% OK 54.5% Poorly 7.5% (Circle one)

7. How would you describe the way in which you are treated by the administrative personnel at your college? — 4.5% — Well 22.4% OK 50.7% Poorly 22.4% (Circle one)

8. Do you get along with your fellow students? — 5.2% — Yes 91.0% No 3.7% (Circle one)

9. Does your college have special facilities for Mexican-American students (e.g., reading rooms, office for student organization, etc.)? — 12.7% — Yes 76.9% No 10.4% (Circle one)

10. If your college does have special facilities for Mexican-American students, what are they?

SEE SCHEDULE K-10 ATTACHED

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN - PART II (cont)

	No Response				
11. Do you perceive Mexican-American students as having any special needs?	3.7%	Yes	79.8%	No	16.4%
		(Circle one)			

12. If you think Mexican-American students do have special needs, what are those needs as you would define them?

Awareness of Cultural Deprivation	33.6%
Financial Assistance	21.5
Better College Prep	21.5
Counselors trained and/or attuned to Chicano needs	21.5
Tutorial & academic help	19.6
English language (communication level)	18.7
Reassurance/moral support/motivation	14.0
More Chicano staff (at all levels)	11.2
Chicano studies (Mexican-American history,culture)	8.4
Chicano organizations	5.6
Knowledge about administrative procedures	5.6*
Don't know/didn't answer	4.7
Miscellaneous	4.7

Please feel free to add any comments that you might have about the subject of this questionnaire.

*Knowledge About Administrative Procedures

Over-all awareness of the campus.
Need of having to pre-register every semester until completed.
To be informed of special services made available to student.
Who he should see in case he has a problem.
Need to know how the college administration works because many friends have gotten "F" because they didn't know they could drop the class.
Information of basic college rules should be set straight to students.

SCHEDULE K-3/K-6

	PART I Question 3	PART I Question 6	PART II Question 1
U.C. Santa Barbara	19.0%	10.5%	17.9%
L.B. State	17.0	15.8	20.1
U.C.L.A.	16.0	7.9	--
Fresno State	14.0	10.5	14.9
E.L.A. City College	13.0	11.8	16.4
U.C. Berkeley	10.0	3.9	6.7
No College Named	9.0	---	6.0*
Los Angeles State	8.0	9.2	---
Sacramento City	8.0	3.9	14.9
Fresno City	8.0	---	.7
Sacramento State	7.0	---	---
Fullerton State	7.0	---	---
Stanford	6.0	5.3	---
U.S.C.	5.0	2.6	---
San Jose State	5.0	---	---
Not specified	5.0	---	2.6
U.C. Santa Cruz	4.0	---	---
Univ. Davis	4.0	5.3	---
State College not specified	3.0	3.9	---
U.C. San Diego	3.0	2.6	---
L.A. City College	3.0	2.6	---
Occidental	2.0	5.3	---
Loyola	2.0	2.6	---
Claremont	2.0	---	---
San Fernando State	2.0	6.6	.7
U.C. Riverside	2.0	---	---
Rio Hondo J.C.	2.0	---	---
Scripps, Pomona	2.0	---	---
Marymount	2.0	3.9	---
St. Mary's	2.0	2.6	---
Miscellaneous	39.0	57.9	---
Pepperdine	---	2.6	---
U.C. Santa Clara	---	5.3	---
Redlands	---	2.6	---
Harbor J.C.	---	2.6	---
Cal Poly (not specified)	---	2.6	---
La Verne	---	2.6	---
American River	---	---	.7
Riverside City College	---	---	.7
Colorado Univ.	---	---	.7

SCHEDULE K-8

How do you think students in high school can best be informed about college opportunities or that a college representative(s) is coming to the high school?

Counselors keep student informed	19.4
Bulletins	15.7
Pamphlets/Literature	13.4

*-Denotes reply was "unknown" or "none."

SCHEDULE K-8 (Continued)

Teachers keep student informed	11.9%
College Representative visits	11.2
Don't know	10.4
More frequent advance notice	9.7
Counselors inform before senior year	9.0
School assemblies for College representatives	8.2
Individual appointments with college representatives	7.5
Visits to college/individual initiative	6.7
Counselors keep abreast of college information	6.0
Special meetings of students to discuss college	6.0
Counselors know individual student needs	5.2
Special Mexican-American College Counselors/Advisors	5.2
Homeroom	5.2
College students (former)	5.2
P.A. system	4.5
Students spread the word	4.5
School newspaper	3.7
All forms of media	3.7
More informative Chicano student recruitment	3.7
Posters	3.0
Counselors send letters to parents/home	3.0
MAS meetings/organizations	3.0
Community newspapers	1.5
Government teachers keep student informed	.7
Miscellaneous	4.5

PART II - SCHEDULE K-4

List the five things that you liked most about your first year in college.

Meeting new people/friends/girls, etc./students	43.3
Courses in general/subjects/classes	39.5
Instructors/faculty/teachers	33.6
School/campus location/beauty/over-all	28.4
Independence/freedom/away from home	18.7
Don't know/None	15.7
Learning experience	14.9
Own schedule/free time/own hours	13.4
New experiences/new environment	12.7
Counselors/counseling Center	11.9
Informal/casual/dress	10.4
Extra curricular activities/recreational/organizations	10.4
M.A.(Chicano) courses/department/studies	7.5
Matured/treated as adult	5.2
Financial/EOP	5.2
Studying	4.5
Facilities in General	3.7
Specific courses (Political science (2), History,Spanish,English,French, Sociology, Psychology, Journalism, Physical Education)	3.7
Athletic Programs/sports	3.7
Library facilities	3.0

PART II - SCHEDULE K-4 (Continued)

Chicano instructors	2.2%
Books	2.2
Political activities	2.2
Chicano organizations	1.5
Chicano special services	..7
Miscellaneous	17.9

PART II - SCHEDULE K-5

List the five things that you disliked most about your first year in college.

Don't know/None	23.9%
Instructors/teachers	19.4
Registration/confusion/long lines	16.4
Competition too stiff/courses too hard	13.4
Classes too large/overcrowded	11.9
Lack of individual help/confusion/lost feeling	11.2
Loneliness	9.7
Specific courses (Art Classes, Science (2), Anthropology, Taking Math and science courses simultaneously, reading assignments, unorganized nursing program, have to wait a semester to get into nursing program.	9.7
Dorm food/cafeteria	9.0
Too expensive	7.5
Courses in general	6.7
Exams/Finals	6.0
Dorm Life	6.0
Administration	6.0
Racial/Racism	5.2
Lack of money	5.2
Parking	5.2
White/Middle/Upper/Class Oriented	5.2
P.E. required	4.5
Not enough Chicano teachers	3.7
Grading system/grades	3.0
Required courses	2.2
Limited material in Library	2.2
Not enough Chicano counselors	1.5
Not enough Chicano students	.7
Miscellaneous	23.9

PART II - SCHEDULE K-10

If your college does have special facilities for Mexican-American students, what are they?

Mecha/mecha trailer (Mex-Am. Center)	36.9%
Chicano Studies Program	21.4
Library	20.4
Mexican-American Organizations (clubs) (not specified)	18.4
Tutoring and academic help	17.5
Counseling	17.5
EOP Center	16.5
Don't Know	14.6
Special Classes (Skill Center, For the Raza Classes--office for Raza Prof. and business needs, Classes to improve one's reading and writing, English-ethnic courses (his., poetry), reading and writing labs, sociology class dealing with Mexican-Americans, Speech class, soccer, many things about Latin America, Reading labs, Spanish class, Special help in reading, math, spelling, concentration, Bilingual special skills services, English and Literature of and by Mexican-Americans, Chicanos Art Center, Chicanos for Creative Medicine, C.C.M.)	14.6
Reading-Study rooms	10.7
Offices (meeting rooms, bungalows)	7.8
Miscellaneous	10.7

APPENDIX L

QUESTIONNAIRE: COMMUNITY COLLEGES

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

(Tabulations based on percentages of total respondents indicated)

This questionnaire is part of a study sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the California State Legislature. The responses to this questionnaire will assist the legislature in understanding the condition of Mexican Americans in higher education in California and will also aid the legislature in the formulation of policy in this area. Please fill out the answers and return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope. Thank you for your cooperation.

1. Does your institution have administrative units whose function is to primarily serve Mexican American or Chicano students?

TOTAL RESPONDING = 74

yes 36.5% no 63.5%

(Circle one)

2. If your answer to the above question is yes, please name those administrative units and give a brief description of their functions.

SEE SCHEDULE L-2 ATTACHED

3. If your institution does not have separate administrative units to serve Chicano students, please name and briefly describe those administrative units wherein your institution has special capabilities for serving these students.

SEE SCHEDULE L-3 ATTACHED

4. Does your institution have curricular offerings that deal exclusively with the Mexican American or Chicano experience?

TOTAL RESPONDING = 74

Yes 78.4% NO 27.6%

(Circle one)

5. If the answer to question #4 is yes, are these courses offered through a "traditional" department (e.g., history, sociology, etc.)?

TOTAL RESPONDING = 58

Yes 72.4% no 27.6%

(Circle one)

6. If the answer to question #5 is no, what is the source of these curricular offerings (e.g., ethnic studies department, Chicano studies department, Mexican American Studies Center, etc.)?

Chicano Studies Department	31.3
Ethnic Studies Division	31.3
Mexican-American Studies	18.8
Department of American Cultures (inc. Mex-Am.Studies)	12.5
Ethnic Studies offerings cutting across discipline lines	6.3
Multi-cultural Studies	6.3

TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

7. If your institution does offer courses in Chicano or Mexican-American studies, do you feel that these courses are of comparable quality to your curricular offerings in general? No Response 8.6%

Yes 89.7% no 1.7%

(Circle one)

TOTAL RESPONDING = 58

8. Does your institution have a stated policy with regard to the admission of Mexican American or Chicano students (e.g., a quota or goal)?

Yes 18.9% no 81.1%

(Circle one)

TOTAL RESPONDING = 74

9. If your institution does have a stated policy, please iterate or paraphrase that policy.

Percentage equal to Mex.-Am. population in district	57.1
Actively recruit in Chicano community with goal to serve all	14.3
Did not describe policy	14.3
Open policy to all who qualify	7.1
Percentage = midpoint between dist.,Mex.Am.pop & Santa Clara Co.pop.	7.1
Studying dropout problem	7.1
Audio/tutorial materials for recruitment	7.1

TOTAL RESPONDING = 14

10. Does your institution have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked specifically for Chicano or Mexican-American students?

TOTAL RESPONDING = 74

yes 17.6% no 82.4%

(Circle one)

11. If your institution does have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked for Chicano or Mexican American students, please iterate that sum or proportion, or describe the policy that dictates the amount of financial aid available to Chicano or Mexican American students.

SEE SCHEDULE L-11 ATTACHED

12. What facilities do you have to inform your students of transfer potential or placement possibilities?

SEE SCHEDULE L-12 ATTACHED

13. Do you have any special facilities for Chicano or Mexican American students in informing them about transfer or placement?

Yes 43.2% No 52.7%

(Circle one)

No Response 4.5%

TOTAL RESPONDING = 74

14. Are there presently any Chicano or Mexican American student counselors on your staff?

yes 74.3% no 24.3%

(Circle one)

No response 1.4%

TOTAL RESPONDING = 74

Please feel free to add any comments you might have about the subject of this questionnaire.

SCHEDULE L-2

Names of administrative units whose function is to serve Mexican-American or Chicano students and brief description of their function.

Counseling	51.9%
Ethnic Studies Dept/M.A. Studies	33.3
Financial Aid	33.3
Dean of Instruction/Dean of Students/Ethnic Coordinator	29.6
Tutorial	25.9
Special Chicano Staff	18.5
Recruits minorities	18.5
Courses (non-specified)	14.8
Special Services/Programs/Comm. Serv. Dir.	11.1
Special facilities (reading room, study room)	11.1
Communications	11.1
Student Development Center	7.4
(Special) Extended Opportunity Program	7.4
Readiness Center/Program	7.4
EOP	7.4
Assistance, general	7.4
Chicano Independent Learning Center	3.7
Multicultural Program	3.7
Open Education Program/Human Relations	3.7
Project See	3.7
Jobs	3.7
Peer Programs	3.7
EOP	3.7
NYC	3.7
UEA	3.7
La Vida Nueva	3.7
Title III	3.7
Summer Programs	3.7

TOTAL RESPONDING = 27

SCHEDULE L-3

Not having separate administrative units to serve Chicano students, name and description of administrative units with special capabilities to serve these students.

Student Personal Services	38.3
Counseling	38.3
Chicano Studies/M.A. Courses	31.9
Extended Opportunity Program/Services	31.9
Financial Aid	29.8
Tutoring	21.3
Human Relations Program	19.1
Office of Instruction	12.8
Special Programs	10.6
Peer Programs/Counseling, Tutoring	10.6
Special Study Center	10.6
Recruiting	8.5
Special Ethnic Staff	8.5
Clubs/Organizations	4.3

SCHEDULE L-3 (continued)

Special Summer Program	4.3%
College Readiness Program	4.3
Dean of Students	4.3
Political Science Courses	2.1
Assistance, general	2.1
Multi-cultural Program	2.1
M E C H A	2.1
Admissions	2.1
None	2.1
Education Information Center	2.1
Foreign Student Advisor	2.1
Student Liaison Center for Ethnic Student help	2.1

TOTAL RESPONDING = 47

SCHEDULE L-11

If your institution does have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked for Chicano or Mexican-American students, please iterate that sum or proportion, or describe the policy that dictates the amount of financial aid available to Chicano or Mexican-American students.

EOP Program	15.4%
At the discretion of Financial Aid Officer	7.7
Co-directors of EOPS Program (one Black, one Chicano) work with financial aid officer and/or his committee to insure equitable distribution	7.7
$26,000 to tutorial services (Chicano only) $20,000 SB 164 direct living grants (for all minorities) All other financial aids NSDL, Work Study, etc. available to all minorities	7.7
$15,000 in EOP funds are earmarked especially (but not exclusively) for minority students. All other financial aid monies based on need of those students who apply	7.7
$120,000-EOP: 80% to Mexican students 75,000 NYC: 80% to Mexican students 80,000 Work Study: 50% to Mexican students 30,000 NDEA Loans: 20% to Mexican students	7.7
About 25% of our student population is Mexican-American and approximately 75-80% of our financial aid resources are earmarked for Mexican-American students	7.7
This sum is determined by amount of grant received from the federal government	7.7
Mexican-American and Blacks receive major portion of all grants and scholarships	7.7
S.B. 164 funds and additional sums available; loans A.S. and student loan fund	7.7
We have earmarked approximately three instructional contract positions for ethnic studies and a proportional amount of hourly monies for staffing such offerings, exclusive of monies earmarked for the Chicano Counselor and the ethnic studies coordinator. 76% of those who have applied for financial aid received such assistance	7.7

SCHEDULE L-11 (continued)

Proportionate amount of Economic Opportunity Program and time of personnel working in EOP (divided between Black and Chicano). Special financial aids officer works on getting more help for Chicano students.	7.7%

NUMBER RESPONDING = 13

SCHEDULE L-12

What facilities do you have to inform your students of transfer potential or placement possibilities?

Counselors/Advisors	74.3%
Placement Office	45.9
Career Guidance Center	16.2
Counselors/Directors EOP Program	13.5
Peer Counseling	9.5
Financial Aids Officer	9.5
Instructors/Mexican American	8.1
Director of Transfer Education	8.1
No response	6.8
Student Service Center	5.4
Brochures/Literature	4.5
Vice-President/Dean of Student Personnel	4.5
Group Human Development	2.7
Guidance Bulletins	2.7
Placement Bulletins/Catalog	2.7
Films, Tapes (Audio-Visual)	2.7
Campus Organizations	2.7
Placement Tests	2.7
Work Experience/Job Training	1.4
Mobile Counseling Unit	1.4
College Newspaper	1.4
Student Body Bulletin	1.4
Office of the Dean of Men	1.4
Study Center	1.4

NUMBER RESPONDING = 74

APPENDIX M

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR INSTITUTIONS IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE SYSTEM AND THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM

FOR INSTITUTIONS IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES SYSTEM AND

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM

(Tabulations based on percentages of total respondents indicated)

This questionnaire is part of a study sponsored by the Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the California State Legislature. The responses to this questionnaire will assist the legislature in understanding the condition of Mexican Americans in higher education in California and will also aid the legislature in the formulation of policy in this area. Please fill out the answers and return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

The questionnaire is divided into two parts. Part I is designed to gather information about the undergraduate school and Part II is designed to gather information about the graduate school. In both cases, if you feel there is insufficient space for a response, please attach any addenda you feel is necessary.

PART I - UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOL

1. Does your institution have administrative units whose function is to primarily serve Mexican American or Chicano students?

   TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

   Yes 56.3% No 43.7%

   (Circle one)

2. If your answer to the above question is yes, please name those administrative units and give a brief description of their function.

   SEE SCHEDULE M-2 ATTACHED

3. If your institution does not have separate administrative units to serve Chicano students, please name and briefly describe those administrative units wherein your institution has special capabilities for these students.

   SEE SCHEDULE M-3 ATTACHED

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES SYSTEM (cont)

4. Does your institution have curricular offerings that deal exclusively with the Mexican American or Chicano experience?
TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

yes 100% No
(Circle one)

5. If the answer to question #4 is yes, are these courses offered through a "traditional" department (e.g., history, sociology, etc.)?
TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

Yes 31.3% No 68.7%
(Circle one)

6. If the answer to question #5 is no, what is the source of these curricular offerings (e.g., ethnic studies dept., Chicano studies dept., Mexican studies center, etc.)?

Chicano Studies	36.4%
Division of Ethnic Studies	27.3
Dept. of Mexican American Studies	18.2
La Raza Studies	18.2
Program on Comparative Cultures	9.1
Interdisciplinary Ethnic Studies	9.1
Both Traditional & Special	9.1
Mexican-American Graduate Studies	9.1

TOTAL RESPONDING = 11

7. If your institution does offer courses in Chicano or Mexican American Studies, do you feel that these courses are of comparable quality to your curricular offerings in general?
TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

Yes 93.8% No 0%
(Circle one)
No Response 6.2%

8. Does your institution have a stated policy with regard to the admission of Mexican American or Chicano students (e.g., a quota or goal)?
TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

Yes 37.5% No 62.5%
(Circle one)

9. If your institution does have a stated policy, please iterate or paraphrase that policy.

SEE SCHEDULE M-9 ATTACHED

10. Does your institution have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked specifically for Chicano or Mexican American students?
TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

Yes 12.5% No 87.5%
(Circle one)

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES SYSTEM (cont)

11. If your institution does have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked for Chicano or Mexican American students, please iterate that sum or proportion or describe the policy that dictates the amount of financial aid available to Chicano or Mexican American students.

25% to 35% of EOP funds are earmarked for Chicanos	50.0%
$585,580 for 1972-73	50.0%
TOTAL RESPONDING = 2	

12. If your institution does not have a stated or formal policy with regard to Mexican American or Chicano student recruitment, admissions, and/or financial aid please express in your own words what your institution's informal policies are in these areas.

SEE SCHEDULE M-12 ATTACHED

13. Approximately what percentage of the Mexican American or Chicano students in your institution are dependent on "special" admissions or financial aid programs? SEE SCHEDULE M-13 ATTACHED

14. Among those Mexican American or Chicano students whose matriculation is dependent on "special" admissions or financial aid programs, how many (in terms of percentage) are dependent solely on your financial aid program (i.e., how many would be admissable under "regular" criteria)? SEE SCHEDULE M-14 ATTACHED

Please attach any information you have regarding the academic success of Chicano students on your campus.

PART II - GRADUATE SCHOOL

1. Does your graduate school have administrative units whose function is to primarily serve Mexican American or Chicano students?
   TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

   yes 26.7% no 73.3%
   (Circle one)

2. If your answer to the above question is yes, please name those administrative units and give a brief description of their function.

   SEE SCHEDULE M-2, PART II, ATTACHED

3. If your graduate school does not have separate administrative units to serve Chicano students, please name and briefly describe those administrative units which have special capabilities for these students.

   SEE SCHEDULE M-3, PART II, ATTACHED

4. Does your graduate school have curricular offerings that deal exclusively with the Mexican American or Chicano experience?
   TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

   yes 26.7% no 73.3%
   (Circle one)

5. If the answer to question #4 is yes, are these courses offered through a "traditional" department (e.g., history, sociology, etc.)?
   TOTAL RESPONDING = 4

   Yes 25.0% no 75.0%
   (Circle one)

6. If the answer to question #5 is no, what is the source of these curricular offerings (e.g., ethnic studies dept., Chicano studies dept., Mexican American studies center, etc.)?

Chicano Studies	66.7%
Program in Comparative Cultures	33.3
Mexican American Graduate Studies	33.3

   TOTAL RESPONDING = 3

7. If your graduate school does offer courses in Chicano or Mexican American Studies, do you feel that these courses are of comparable quality to your curricular offerings in general?
   TOTAL RESPONDING = 4

   Yes 100.0% No
   (Circle one)

PART II - GRADUATE SCHOOL (cont)

8. Does your graduate school have a stated policy with regard to the admission of Mexican American or Chicano students (e.g., a quota or goal)?

Yes 13.3% No 86.7%
(Circle one)

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

9. If your graduate school does have a stated policy, please iterate or paraphrase that policy.

Recruitment of Qualified M-A Students	100.0%
Establishment of Fellowships	50.0%
Minority Students admittance priority	50.0%

TOTAL RESPONDING = 2

10. Does your graduate school have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked specifically for Chicano or Mexican American students?

Yes 6.7% No 93.3%
(Circle one)

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

11. If your graduate school does have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked for Chicano or Mexican American students, please iterate that sum or proportion or describe the policy that dictates the amount of financial aid available to Chicano or Mexican American students.

20 Campus fellowships ($2,500.00 each)	100.0%

NUMBER RESPONDING = 1

12. In general terms, what is the distribution of Mexican American or Chicano students among your graduate departments?

SEE SCHEDULE M-12 ATTACHED

13. Is the distribution of matriculated Chicano students among your graduate departments roughly proportionate to Chicano applications to departments?

Yes 40.0% No .0%
(Circle one)
No Response 60.0%

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

PART II - GRADUATE SCHOOL (cont)

14. If the answer to question #13 is no, please comment on why you think this is so.

No responses as none were "no" in Question 13.

15. If your institution does not have a stated or formal policy with regard to Mexican American or Chicano student recruitment, admissions, and/or financial aid please express in your own words what your institution's fnformal polices are in these areas.

SEE SCHEDULE M-15 ATTACHED

16. Approximately what percentage of the Mexican American or Chicano students in your graduate school are dependent on "special" admissions or financial aid programs?

SEE SCHEDULE M-16 ATTACHED

17. Among those Mexican American or Chicano students whose matriculation is dependent on "special" programs, how many (in terms of percentage) are dependent solely on your financial aid program (i.e., how many would be admissable under "regular" criteria)?

SEE SCHEDULE M-17 ATTACHED

Please feel free to add any comments you might have about the subject of this questionnaire.

SCHEDULE M-2

Name of administrative units and brief description of functions serving Mexican-American or Chicano students:

EOP	88.9%
Center for Chicano (& Amer. Ind.) Studies	44.4
Recruiting	44.4
Counseling	44.4
Curriculum Development	44.4
Tutorial	33.3
Financial Aid	33.3
La Raza Studies	22.2
Ethnic Studies	22.2
Dept. of Mexican-American Studies	22.2
Special Admissions	22.2
Liaison with Comm.	22.2
Special Services	11.1
EPIC (student-volunteer participation in Community services)	11.1
HEIP	11.1
Minority Relations Office	11.1
Model Cities Scholarship	11.1
Affirmative Action	11.1
Chicano Affairs	11.1
Special Chicano Staff	11.1
Peer Counseling	11.1
Placement (job)	11.1
Academic Transfer	11.1
Talent Search	11.1
Miscellaneous	11.1

TOTAL RESPONDING = 9

SCHEDULE M-3

Name of administrative units and function having special capabilities for Mexican-American or Chicano students if separate units not available.

EOP	42.9
Tutorial	42.9
Special Services	28.6
Recruiting	28.6
None named	28.6
Hidden Talent	14.3
Division of Ethnic Studies	14.3
Financial Aid	14.3
Special Programs	14.3
Division of Interdisciplinary Studies	14.3
Counseling	14.3
Miscellaneous	14.3

TOTAL RESPONDING = 7

SCHEDULE M-9

If your institution does have a stated policy with regard to admission of Mexican American or Chicano students, please iterate or paraphrase that policy:

Disadvantaged Mexican American or Chicano students seeking admission are admitted according to the following formula: Number of persons admitted as disadvantaged first-time freshmen shall not exceed 2% of all persons anticipated to be admitted as first-time freshmen; number of persons admitted as disadvantaged undergraduate transfers shall not exceed 2% of all persons anticipated to be admitted as undergraduate transfers.	66.7%
Admitting a specific number (which may vary from year to year) of non-white students normally filled equally from Black, Chicano, Native Americans and Oriental Americans	16.7
10% of total student population is minority, 40% Chicano	16.7

TOTAL RESPONDING = 6

SCHEDULE M-12

If no stated or formal policy on Mexican-American or Chicano student recruitment, admissions and/or financial aid, state informal policies in these areas.

Assistance administered on individual need basis	31.3%
None given	25.0
EOP, aid given to all disadvantaged students	18.8
Within our "Special Admissions" program categories, allocations are worked out each year with cooperation of the involved community groups	6.2
Department of Mex.-Am. Studies & EOP staff-extensive recruitment	6.2
Because it would be contrary to the law to limit admission to Chicanos and other minorities to some stated limit or goal and to provide financial aid accordingly, this university has a general goal of assisting minorities to the limit of its resources within the law. Since the campus is somewhat removed from large population centers, and educational expenses are higher because the student must live away from home, the number of minorities is less than their total proportion within the state. The campus actively recruits minority students and seeks funds to help support them. State, federal and campus resources are all used to the maximum extent to recruit and finance minorities.	6.2
EOP recruitment limited to university service area	6.2
4% Special Admissions Rule	6.2
Active recruitment	6.2
Financial Aid Office	6.2
100% for incoming freshmen, 75% for sophomores, 50% for juniors and seniors; $269,000 for 150 students for 1971-72	6.2
Regular admissions operates in a formal manner with no special priority to Mexican-Americans. Special admissions (EOP) generally accepts about forty percent of their entrants from the Chicano community. Special admissions (other) has three small programs (Pinto, Veteran's Outreach,	

SCHEDULE M-12 (Continued)

HEIP) that give no priority but, because of the character of the recruiting effort, tend to bring in proportionally larger numbers of Mexican-Americans. The total enrollment from the latter programs was less than one hundred for 1971-72.

Standard Federal and State guidelines are employed in the award of all aid monies. Because of their low income backgrounds and relatively high undergraduate enrollment, Chicanos receive substantial cumulative awards. Two special University-administered activities, the East-Northeast Model Cities Scholarship Program and the EOP-Associated Student Emergency Loan Program do tend to award heavily to Chicanos because of the particular populations served by these activities. 6.2%

TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

SCHEDULE M-13

Approximately what percentage of the Mexican American or Chicano students in your institution are dependent on "special" admissions or financial aid programs?

	Aid	Admissions
Not answered/Not available	31.3%	31.3%
71% to 80%	18.8	18.8
1% to 10%	12.5	12.5
41% to 50%	12.5	12.5
21% to 30%	6.2	6.2
51% to 60%	6.2	6.2
81% to 90%	6.2	6.2
91% to 100%	6.2	6.2

TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

SCHEDULE M-14

Among those Mexican-American or Chicano students whose matriculation is dependent on "special" admissions or financial aid programs, how many (in terms of percentage) are dependent solely on your financial aid program (i.e., how many would be admissable under "regular" criteria?

Not answered/Not available	25.0%
91% to 100%	18.8
41% to 50%	12.5
Zero/None	12.5
1% to 10%	6.2
21% to 30%	6.2
31% to 40%	6.2
61% to 70%	6.2
71% to 80%	6.2

TOTAL RESPONDING = 16

SCHEDULE M-2, PART II

If your graduate school has administrative units whose function is to primarily serve Mexican-American or Chicano students, please name those administrative units and give a brief description of their function.

Counseling	75.0%
EOP	50.0
Recruiting	50.0
Tutorial	50.0
Financial Aid	50.0
Center for Chicano (& Amer. Ind.) Studies	25.0
Ethnic Studies	25.0
Special Services	25.0
HEIP	25.0
Minority Relations Office	25.0
Model Cities Scholarship	25.0
Chicano Affairs	25.0
Curriculum Development	25.0
Special Admissions	25.0
Peer Counseling	25.0
Placement (job)	25.0
Academic Transfer	25.0
Talent Search	25.0
Liaison with Comm.	25.0
Miscellaneous	25.0

TOTAL RESPONDING - 4

SCHEDULE M-3, PART II

Not having separate administrative units to serve Chicano students, please name and briefly describe administrative units which have special capabilities for these students.

None named	50.0%
Work Study positions	16.7
Social work education	16.7
EOP	8.3
Tutorial	8.3
Financial Aid	8.3
Counseling	8.3
Recruiting	8.3
Graduate Minority Programs	8.3
Student Affairs	8.3
Social Work in Motion	8.3
Foreign Languages	8.3

TOTAL RESPONDING = 12

SCHEDULE M-12, PART II

In general terms what is the distribution of Mexican-American or Chicano students among your graduate departments?

No meaningful (no data) analysis of distribution possible	40.0%
Not answered	20.0
.01%	6.7

SCHEDULE M-12, PART II (Continued)

2.5%	6.7%
PE (3), Educ (2), Arch (1), Bio Sci (1), Bus Ad (3)	6.7
Approximately same as undergraduate	6.7
School of Education services bulk of Chicano students	6.7
Most numerous in Law, School of Social Welfare, School of Educ., School of Public Health, Social Sciences and Humanities	6.7

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

SCHEDULE M-15, PART II

If no stated or formal policy with regard to Mexican-American or Chicano student recruitment, admissions, and/or financial aid, please express in your own words what your institution's informal policies are in these areas.

No answer	40.0%
Recruitment at departmental level	13.3
Admission requirements waived for those who show potential	13.3
Assistance administered on individual needs	13.3
Affirmative Action Program	6.7
Graduate Students admitted on quality of undergraduate preparation	6.7
None	6.7
Social Work education	6.7
Psychology	6.7

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

SCHEDULE M-16, PART II

Approximately what percentage of the Mexican-American or Chicano students in your graduate school are dependent on "special" admissions or financial aid programs?

	Admissions	Aid
Not answered/not available	40.0%	53.3%
Zero/none	20.0	20.0
71% to 80%	13.3	--
81% to 90%	13.3	13.3
21% to 30%	6.7	6.7
91% to 100%	6.7	---
41% to 50%	---	6.7

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

SCHEDULE M-17, PART II

Among those Mexican-American or Chicano students whose matriculation is dependent on "special" programs, how many (in terms of percentage) are dependent solely on your financial aid program (i.e., how many would be admissable under "regular" criteria)?

Not Answered/Not available	60.0%
91% to 100%	13.3
Zero/None	13.3
71% to 80%	6.7
81% to 90%	6.7

TOTAL RESPONDING = 15

PART I: TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO SELECTED QUESTIONS BY SYSTEMS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

	University of California		State University and Colleges System	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Does your institution have administrative units whose function is to primarily serve Mexican-American or Chicano students?	2	4	7	3
4. Does your institution have curricular offerings that deal exclusively with the Mexican-American or Chicano student?	6	0	10	0
5. If the answer to Question 4 is "yes", are these courses offered through a "traditional" department (e.g. History, Sociology, etc.)?	3	3	2	8
7. If your institution does offer courses in Chicano or Mexican-American Studies, do you feel that these courses are of comparable quality to your curricular offerings in general?	5	1*	10	0
8. Does your institution have a stated policy with regard to the admission of Mexican-American or Chicano students (e.g., a quota or goal)?	2	4	4	6
10. Does your institution have a specific sum or portion of its financial aid resources earmarked specifically for Chicano or Mexican-American students?	1	5	1	9

* - No Response

PART II: TABULATION OF RESPONSES TO SELECTED QUESTIONS ON GRADUATE SCHOOLS

	University of California		State University and Colleges System	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Does your graduate school have administrative units whose function is to primarily serve Mexican-American or Chicano students?	1	5	3	6
4. Does your graduate school have curricular offerings that deal exclusively with the Mexican-American or Chicano experience?	2	4	2	7
5. If the answer to Question 4 is "yes," are these courses offered through a "traditional" department (e.g. History, Sociology, etc.)?	3	3*	1	8*
7. If your graduate school does offer courses in Chicano or Mexican-American Studies, do you feel that these courses are of comparable quality to your curricular offerings in general?	2	4*	2	7*
8. Does your graduate school have a stated policy with regard to the admission of Mexican-American or Chicano students (e.g., a quota or goal)?	1	5	1	8
10. Does your graduate school have a specific sum or proportion of its financial aid resources earmarked specifically for Chicano or Mexican-American students?	1	5	0	9
13. Is the distribution of matriculated Chicano students among your graduate departments roughly proportionate to Chicano applications to the departments?	2	4*	4	4*

* - No Response

APPENDIX N

SOME COMMENTS FROM THE STUDENTS ANSWERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES

I don't like the set-up that the high schools have. They urge only a few students on to do better in school, and helping these students to a great degree. The other students, are just pushed through without much concern from the counselors or teachers.

Good students that have a desire to learn will do well on their own, they don't need much help, they'll go on to college if they want to.

The students that are doing poorly and are apathetic about everything, they're the one's that need help.

My main reason for not attending college is because I decided to marry instead, but I do intend on taking a few classes in the near future at Citrus Jr. College.

The reason for my going to a city college is because I have no major minor or whatever. I'm trying to find what I want to do. State universities seem to be for people who know where they're going.

In order to interest more students in higher education, I feel that more Chicano college recruiters should be sent to high schools. I feel a Chicano will want to go to college, if he learns about it from one of his own people.

All of my years in high school, I have never had a good counselor. If you needed something or wanted something done, you had to check about half-a-dozen times to make sure the counselor didn't mess it up.

I really don't think there is to many opportunities for Mexican people or for the Negro people.

There's too many people in America that takes the opportunities away from us.

Teachers should stop discouraging young people from going to college despite the fact a student may have a "D" average in high school. If the student is determined that he (or she) want to go to college he should be given the benefit of the doubt. I as a student earned a 3.3 grade point average at school, not bad for having the reputation of a goof-off by many teachers, yet several teachers actually tried to discourage me from going to a 4 year college. One went as far as saying,"The only reason Malcalester accepted you was because you're Mexican and they need the <u>money</u>!" Luckily I'm a very cruel and outspoken person when I get insulted by anyone and replied to here that it may be true that because I'm Mexican-American I might have had an easier time getting admitted, but I pointed out to her that <u>5</u> students from my high school applied there and I was the only one accepted. I also showed her (because of my carrying my letters all the time)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

my admittance papers of U.C. Irvine, U.C.L.A., Cal-State L.A., University of Redlands and Immaculate Heart. This quieted her! This thing about me being loud saved me from embarressment from the class, but just imagine a person that is quiet and not outspoken, this teacher could of been a menace to that person's future plans.

Teachers should encourage a pupil on, maybe he or she is not the "A" student of the class, but I've heard and met people that were doing "D" in high school and actually doing "B" and "C" work in college.

Because in my high school my counselor always wanted to put down minority students, she always hated us, she would only help the White students. She never really talked to me about college she would only tell me to sign papers if I wanted to go to college. She told me to talk to the Mexican (EOP) counselor. The EOP counselor helped me more than her. I wanted to change her but they would tell me to have a note written by my mother why I wanted some other counselor. My mother never wrote nothing because she don't like to complain. So I never got her changed. I had problems in school but I didn't want to see her, because when I went to see her she would tell me to come the next day because she was busy. When I went back she would have somebody there or she would be on her break or lunch.

Through all my years in high school I never learn nothing. I needed help in writing sentences right and I had a problem in pronouncing words. They never gave me a class that would help me in this things.

The EOP are the only ones that are helping me. If it wasn't for them I wouldn't have nothing to look on to life. I would be nothing. But I'm glad they have the EOP to help us out. I'm glad you asked this questions because I always wanted to tell somebody about my counselor how she was with me. I never told the school principal because he would probably want a meeting with both me and her and I didn't want nothing to do with her. I hope you understand, if you understand I thank you very much. Thanks again for doing this questions.

Its very hard to write down everything. Many of the counselors, in fact all of them, were very helpful. I really can't explain much more, I could explain it better in person if you would like to hear my comments. One thing - when school first starts in Sept. the counselors should ask all their students about applying to colleges, so that they may do it then and not wait til the beginning of October to send for applications and info.

P.S. Terribly sorry for not sending this when I received it, I have been working in the cannery 12 hrs. a day and barely have time to sleep and I forgot about this.

Some students from San Fernando Valley State College came to Oxnard High School during the school year and did everything possible to inform the students to go to school. They did alot for the students. Oh, by the way representatives came from other colleges, but I couldn't remember the rest. But they did all that was possible to get the students to go in the college. The rest was up to the students.

1. Push programs thru all the kids starting by freshmen on up. 2. Push work study programs 3. Push tutoring sessions, too!!

Chicano teachers and counselors administrators are needed desperately.

It isn't only the school's responsibility to inform the student of college, the student should be interested enough to find out facts for himself. When the student is interested enough to find out facts for himself with the help of a teacher the student should be able to find out more than enough to start him on his way to a better education. That is the name of the game, PUSH AND STRIVE. If the teacher adds the push to a striving and willing student, the student is sure to make something out of himself if it is possible. The minority groups (blacks and browns) need the push, because the strive and willingness is there. I hope most of the students who have a chance don't mess it up because I know how hard it is to be accepted to college and how hard it is to make it. If you see a willing student, help him find his way or a gifted person may be left to the world to be lost and never find his way to the way of happiness.

The only reason I was on the right track was because I was always being pushed by my parents, and close friends. I don't believe I would have made it through my senior year without the help of N.Y.C. its a federally funded program which pays you for going to school half a day and working the other half or being tutored. The school system itself was really getting on my nerves, it didn't interest me anymore like it used to. Without the encouragement of a Mex.-Amer. counselor I probably would have quit. I believe we do need more minority teacher and counselors. Now that a certain program has gone into effect in the Ventura County area, hiring more minorities. Alot of friends I have talked to feel they have more of a chance now, I know I have a positive attitude getting all that help from my counselor. I hope these questions will be put to some use and not stacked up and put away like a lot of other things!!

I feel that unless a student actually has the drive and mentality to go to college, there is no way he can get a higher school education. Many students think that a 4 year college is the only way, but that is totally false. Jr. college's have been constructed all over Ca. to prove this false.

I, myself, am going to a Jr. college, not necessarily because I want to, but because my family is so large that I cannot pay for a 4 year college tuition. Because I am White, I found it very difficult to apply for big scholarships------most of them went to minority students. Great in some respects!!! If they truly have the drive a Jr. college could also be their goal--its not very expensive and most important--- the education is just as good. Minorities are not the only ones in need of funds--total scholarships are not the answer. Let them earn part of their way at least. Nothing is appreciated unless actual time, effort and money is expediated. Thank You!!!

I believe the counciling staff of Azusa High made a strong concerted effort to direct every graduating student of Azusa High in a direction they believed to be his greatest potential.

I am a mediocre student, however, my councelor made contact with me to discuss career and college opportunities.

I believe a strict college prep course is undesirable. When looking for a part time job, one is not prepared with any skills. Certain skilled courses should be required because these may be useful in college (re: typing, shorthand, auto)

I was, but I'm trying to find out if they have some entries. If there are still some entries would you please send me one or where would I pick one up? I do need your help)

Why you want to know all this, when you know and I know that in the Country the education for a Mexican-America or Mexican or Latin American all the time is going to be the same as all this time has been.

The education here for the brown people is filled with discrimination---and the studies are so low. They don't teach you like it suppose to be, why don't they teach like they teach to the Americans, but no they don't want us to learn like the American, even when they say that they teach the same, that's a lie.

I feel Bakersfield College is a great chance in higher careers to the Mexican-American because Bakersfield College will accept Mexican Americans as they accept Blacks and Whites.

If in need of aid they will help Mex-Amer. whether you've flunked exams, they still give you the opportunity to take another.

They should have more individual college counseling to find the right college, trade, or vocational school for that individual. Most of the students aren't aware of all the opportunities open to them. I come from a family where my brother and sister and in-laws are all college grads. I had definite plans about college and I received more help from my relatives and my own initiative and drive, than I did from the counselors at my school. The counselors main concern seemed to be about scholorships. That's a good concern, but they have to get all the kids applying and planning to attend college before they start handing out the money. What I mean is that they should worry about sending more kids to school and spread the money around more evenly. Usually the same kids get all the money. They're the smart ones, the top in the class, they go to school because they are sure about it and "we" get all the money.

Chicano students should be encouraged more and more. Right now counselors aren't encouraging them enough.

If the counselors would make sure the Mexican-Americans were taking college prep classes from the nineth grade on instead of letting them mess around. Hang around the same scum they have hung around with for years. You have to let them know you care other wise they are going to be the same uneducated Mexicans they were in the nineth as they were in the 12th. They act like they don't care but they do. They just need to know some one else cares and is willing to fight them to help themselves.

We are going to school to learn. So why can't you get people to push them to learn. Your teachers are to easy and to scared. If you had more teachers like Setlich and Val Harper it would be a better school for everyone. And I know them Mexicans would want to try harder because teachers like this care.

APPENDIX O

SOME COMMENTS FROM THE STUDENTS ANSWERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR COLLEGE FRESHMEN

I have only attended VCSB for one quarter, and am hoping to get a teacher's credential. The "center" has been a great help to me, because these people have a greater insight into the problems of the Chicano.

There are too many professors at CSUF who should have their classes audited by people in the community so that we could get rid of some of these horrible bigoted professors.

Mexican-American people have to work extra hard to get a good grade not because we are dumber; but, because of the inequities that have fallen on us.

I had a professor who made the following statement: "Mexican-American students are born stupid, so when you begin teaching, don't be overly concerned with these children. Place all your emphasis with the upper class and middle class white child."

What's it for? To find out the problems of the down-trodden Chicano student? I don't feel college students of any color should need any but financial aid. College is not the place to find out you're not college material. Isn't that what entrance exams are for. As for language problems, no one but foreign nationals should have any language problems on the college level. After all, if a person is serious about college, he should take the trouble to learn English. This is college, not nursery school. We shouldn't need anyone to lead us around by the hand. I don't know about you but I don't like field work.

I would like you to note that my parents stressed the need of a higher education so I have known that I wanted to go to college since I was in elementary school. Most Mexican-Americans do not have the extra push I had. I played the game and stuck to the books so the counselors did inform me and talk to me about the opportunities available to me. But, the majority (almost all) of the Mexican-American students did not have the desire to go to college because no one ever discussed the possibilities to them, so they did not take the classes needed. Also, many kind of wanted to go but no one ever told them about the tests they had to take and the papers they had to fill out. Also they were not told about financial assistance which is almost the foremost blockade in a Chicano students mind.

I did not complete 1 year and it's my first school. I will enroll next semester and will go the distance. At the beginning of last year the first day I was shaking hands with everybody. They all came up to me, visa-versa. My major will be sociology or whatever my counselors advice me like whats best suited.

P.S. Hope I didn't say too much, but those are really my feelings.

The number of Chicano students on campus as related to our numbers in population is small. We need more Chicano students in the colleges and universities of Cal.

P.S. I am a Junior and not a freshman, also a JC transfer from SBCC.

Most Chicanos can make it at college- even if not well prepared in high school- if they can get over their bad study habits, attitudes toward useless subjects and the rejection of the unfamiliar (college vs barrio).

College or education should be free. Money is very necessary to get by in college. Money should have no business in education. Grants and loans are just a start the wrong way. Mexican-Americans on the average are very poor. Making our opportunities slimmer to complete college than any other non-Mexican student. All education should be free.

Me myself, being a Mexican-American, do not disrespect my heritage- but, I do feel no sympathy for the Chicano. The Chicano, nowadays, wants to be recognized and praised. They are going about everything the wrong way. Sympathy is not the answer---

I don't feel this survey will do much good. It takes more than a piece of paper with statements to educate others about ourselves. Plus surveys may be interpreted differently by different people.

The Mexican-American community unlike most other minority ethnic groups adheres tenaciously to the past traditions. Consequently, this community has found it difficult to actually think of themselves as American, as the Italians, and the Irish have done. Special facilities for students belonging to these groups, would be advantageous to them, but also detrimental to ultimate cause- peaceful co-existence within a stronger, sometimes hostile American monolith. If special reading rooms for Mexican-American students were to be planned and erected, the other minority groups would harbor a special disliking for the Mexican-American students. Further alienation would result.

I think it would be more appropriate if you asked kids who did not go to college what is wrong with the educational system. Asking only kids who "played the game" and went on to college is bound to give you a very narrow look into the situation. Chicanos in college are a very small percentage of all college age Chicano kids. This questionnaire cannot give you a good reading.

The stated purpose of this questionnaire is not specific enough. As a Chicano student I am prone to question the intent of this survey because in the past, surveys on the Mexican-American have been used to pass negative legislation for the Mexican students. I feel that Chicanos should be given a maximum opportunity to attend the state university and University of Calif. systems.

I think the Master Plan, as I understand it, is unfair, discriminating, and a disgrace to the Constitution.

I would like to have some feed back on the results of this questionnaire. Who is it going to "benefit"? Is it merely to set quotas on Chicanos in higher education? Or is it another one of those countless do-nothing surveys by the dominant majority in order to reassure themselves that they are still in control???

This questionnaire does not address itself to the problems Chicanos have in the university system. The university should fund more Upward Bound Programs like the one at UCSB which is very unique. It prepares Chicanos for the university system on a personal and well-prepared manner. More questions should have been asked like the implementation of a Summer E & P pilot program addressing itself to problems like reading, writing and the sciences.

I hope that these forms are really used to higher the education. Not just shined on like most questionnaires are. They make it sound like its the very truth that something will definitely be done. Which turns out that their just trying to make time in sending out questionnaires and wasting the ones who fill them out.

I hope these questionnaires get something done besides paper work.

. I wasn't going to fill this out because I thought it was more junk but I have a sister who is just entering college and I hope this questionnaire might help her.

I am now enrolled in Calif-State Univ. at Fresno and am studying pre-veterinarian medicine. After a couple years at Fresno I wish to enroll at Univ. of Calif. at Davis to further follow up my studying of veterinarian medicine. But I feel if I am accepted into the school I will not have sufficient finances to meet the demands of the tuitions of the University of Calif. So I was wondering, as a Mexican-American, what aides are available to me to get into and being able to stay in financially, a university. Would you please send me some information on the subject

Much more help for the Chicano is urgently needed on the high school level. As the teaching institutions stand now, they are very poor and lack in really teaching anything. The teachers are cold and only interested in getting the Anglo students to college. They totally disregard the Chicano and label him as a "problem" in their class rather than a fellow human being.

I have nothing to say about the questionnaire - what I do have to say is that E.O.P. has been the best thing that's happened to me at school (educational wise). I personally have difficulty in my reading and spelling, but fortunately I have had help from E.O.P.

APPENDIX P

SPANISH SURNAME STUDENTS AS A
PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL STUDENT BODIES
IN THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS
1970

SIGNIFICANT DATA REGARDING EOP
and
CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

SPANISH SURNAME STUDENTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL STUDENT BODIES IN THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS 1970

System	Percentage of Spanish Surname Students
1. Grades K-12	16.0%
2. Enrolled in Community Colleges	7.9%
3. California State University and Colleges:	
A. Undergraduates, full-time students	5.4%
B. Graduate & Professional	3.0%
4. University of California:	
A. Undergraduates	3.3%
B. Graduate	2.8%

SIGNIFICANT DATA REGARDING EOP and CHICANOS IN HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

Percentage of Chicano population at University of California who are there via the EOP route	72%*
Chicanos as a percentage of all EOP Students in the California State University and College System - 1972	43%*
Percentage of EOP Students enrolling at the University of California in the fall of 1969 who returned in the fall of 1970 (from a total group of 100 students)	92%*
Retention rate of EOP Students for such students completing the spring semester of 1969-1970	85%**
Retention rate of EOP Students admitted during the first year of the program at the State University and Colleges System who persisted to the second year	80%*

Sources:* Marguerite Archie Speech, March 16, 17, 1972, Western College Association Meeting, San Jose, California

** Council Report 71-5, April 1971, Coordinating Council for Higher Education (Appendix C).